DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 219 950 FL 013 136

AUTHOR	Foidart, Donald
TITLE	French Immersion Programmes in Manitoba: An Evaluation. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	CERECO Inc. (Centre for Research and Consultation), Winnipeg (Manitoba).
SPONS AGENCY	Manitoba Dept. of Education, Winnipeg.
PUB DATE	Apr 81
NOTE	276p.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC12 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; Bilingual Education; Elementary Secondary Education; English; Foreign Countries; *French; *Immersion Programs; Language Proficiency; Language Skills; Mathematics; *Program Evaluation; *Second Language Learning
IDENTIFIERS	*Manitoba

ABSTRACT

Achievement in French and English language skills and in mathematics is compared among groups of immersion students in Grades 3, 6, and 9 in the province of Manitoba. Comparisons are also made between these groups of immersion students and a sample of students whose native language is French. Different types of programs (early and late, total and partial) offered in different settings are considered in the study. The parents, teachers, and principals of students in the study were asked to respond to questionnaires designed to provide additional information on French immersion programs in Manitoba. The study indicates that the immersion students perform as well as, or better than, the national norms in English and mathematics. French immersion programs have no negative effects on achievement in those subjects. In French language achievement and proficiency, the early total immersion program in an immersion setting produces the best results. The type of program and the setting influence French language development: students in an immersion setting and in a total immersion program obtain higher scores than those in an English setting or in a partial immersion program. (Author/AMH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED219950

FRENCH IMMERSION PROGRAMMES IN MANITOBA: AN EVALUATION

FINAL REPORT

APRIL, 1981

THE FRENCH IMMERSION
RESEARCH PROJECT
MANITOBA

This Research Report was undertaken by the Department of Education in cooperation with participating school divisions during the 1980-81 school year. The study was directed by the Bureau de l'Education française.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Authorized for Release
by the
Bureau de l'Education française
Department of Education

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Manitoba Dept of Education
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Dr. R.J. Duhamel, Assistant Deputy Minister

FL013136

THE CONCLUSIONS AND OPINIONS IN THIS REPORT ARE THOSE OF THE PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR AND DO NOT NECESSARILY REFLECT THE VIEWS OR POLICIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION.

PREFACE

Those responsible for the introduction of programs of study at the divisional level are frequently faced with a confusing array of information about possible choices and often, that information is incomplete, conflicting, and unintelligible to all but the sophisticated researcher.

The Bureau de l'Education française of the Department of Education in cooperation with school divisions has contracted with a research group for a study on the current French immersion program in Manitoba. The researchers have completed an extensive analysis of Manitoba programs, as well as a report of the current literature on French-language instruction.

The Bureau de l'Education française has contracted with Dr. D.A. Downie for the provision of a summary document. A layman's report, also prepared by Dr. Downie, focuses upon questions that concern parents in considering the possibility of placing their children in immersion programs.

The Bureau de l'Education française would like to express particular appreciation to the co-operating divisions and their representatives who provided guidance and support during the project. A special thank you is also extended to all of the other people involved in the project.

R.J. Duhamel,
Assistant Deputy Minister

FRENCH IMMERSION PROGRAMMES

IN MANITOBA:

AN EVALUATION

FINAL REPORT

APRIL, 1981

DONALD FOIDART, PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR

CERECO INC.
Centre for Research and Consultation
575 St. Mary's Road
Suite 102
WINNIPEG, Man.
R2M 3L6

Tel.: (204) 247-6750

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	i
FOREWORD	ii
ABSTRACT	iv
I - INTRODUCTION	1
II - REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	3
English Language Skills	5
French Language Skills	9
French Immersion Programmes and Cognitive Development	9
The Setting	11
Attitudes and Motivation in Second Language Learning	12
III - RESEARCH OBJECTIVES AND LIMITATIONS	14
IV - RESEARCH METHOD	17
A) Subjects	17
B) Tests and Questionnaires	18
C) Schedules and Procedures of Test and Questionnaire Administration	25
V - PRESENTATION OF RESULTS	27
A) Descriptive Statistics of the Student Population	27
B) Socio-Economic Status	33
C) Covariates and Achievement Results	34
D) Achievement in English and Mathematics	42
E) French Language Skills	52
F) Students' Motivation, Attitudes and Activities	92
G) Parental Attitudes and Motivation	106
H) Teachers' Characteristics	120
I) Principals' Characteristics	137
VI - SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	143
A) English Language Achievement	143
B) Mathematics Achievement	144
C) French Language Achievement and Proficiency	145
D) General Characteristics	148
E) Conclusions	151
F) Educational Implications	152
BIBLIOGRAPHY	
APPENDIX 1 to APPENDIX 7	

LIST OF TABLES

		PAGE
TABLE 1	TOTAL POPULATION INVOLVED IN THE STUDY, BY GRADE LEVEL	17
TABLE 2	TOTAL TARGET POPULATION AND STUDENT AND PARENT POPULATION RETAINED FOR ANALYSIS, BY GRADE	27
TABLE 3	DISTRIBUTION OF CLASSES, BY SETTING, TYPE OF PROGRAMME AND GRADE	29
TABLE 4	PERCENTAGE OF INSTRUCTION IN FRENCH, BY GROUP AND GRADE	30
TABLE 5	AVERAGE AGE OF STUDENTS, BY GROUP AND GRADE	33
TABLE 6	CORRELATION MATRIX OF COVARIATES AND ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS - IMMERSION STUDENTS GRADE 3	35
TABLE 7	CORRELATION MATRIX OF COVARIATES AND ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS - IMMERSION STUDENTS GRADE 6	36
TABLE 8	CORRELATION MATRIX OF COVARIATES AND ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS - IMMERSION STUDENTS GRADE 9	37
TABLE 9	CORRELATION MATRIX OF RESULTS ON FRENCH PROFICIENCY TESTS, FRENCH COMPARATIVE GROUP GRADE 3	39
TABLE 10	CORRELATION MATRIX OF RESULTS ON FRENCH PROFICIENCY TESTS, FRENCH COMPARATIVE GROUP GRADE 6	40
TABLE 11	CORRELATION MATRIX OF RESULTS ON FRENCH PROFICIENCY TESTS, FRENCH COMPARATIVE GROUP GRADE 9	41
TABLE 12	ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE OF ENGLISH AND MATHEMATICS ACHIEVEMENT, IMMERSION STUDENTS - GRADE 3	42
TABLE 12A	TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS C.T.B.S - VOCABULARY - GRADE 3	43
TABLE 12B	TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS C.T.B.S. - READING - GRADE 3	43
TABLE 12C	TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS C.T.B.S. - MATHS CONCEPTS - GRADE 3	44

PAGE

TABLE 12D	TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS CANADIAN NORMS, BY GROUP - GRADE 3	45
TABLE 13	ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE OF ENGLISH AND MATHEMATICS ACHIEVEMENT - GRADE 6	47
TABLE 13A	TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS C.T.B.S. - VOCABULARY - GRADE 6	48
TABLE 13B	TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS C.T.B.S. - READING - GRADE 6	48
TABLE 13C	TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS C.T.B.S. - MATHS PROBLEMS - GRADE 6	48
TABLE 13D	TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS CANADIAN NORMS, BY GROUP - GRADE 6	49
TABLE 14	ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE OF ENGLISH AND MATHEMATICS ACHIEVEMENT - GRADE 9	50
TABLE 14A	TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS - ENGLISH GRADE 9	51
TABLE 14B	TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS - MATHEMATICS GRADE 9	51
TABLE 14C	TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS CANADIAN NORMS, BY GROUP - GRADE 9	52
TABLE 15	NUMBER OF ITEMS IN FRENCH TESTS, BY GRADE	53
TABLE 16	ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE OF ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS ON THE TEST DE FRANÇAIS DU MANITOBA - GRADE 3	54
TABLE 16A	TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS TEST DE FRANÇAIS - VOCABULAIRE - GRADE 3	56
TABLE 16B	TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS TEST DE FRANÇAIS - ORTHOGRAPHE, PONCTUATION ET MAJUSCULES - GRADE 3	56
TABLE 16C	TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS TEST DE FRANÇAIS - GRAMMAIRE - GRADE 3	57
TABLE 16D	TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS TEST DE FRANÇAIS - LECTURE SILENCIEUSE - GRADE 3	58
TABLE 17	ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE OF THE RESULTS OF THE CLOZE AND AURAL COMPREHENSION TESTS - GRADE 3	59

		PAGE
TABLE 17A	TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS CLOZE TEST - GRADE 3	59
TABLE 17B	TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS AURAL COMPREHENSION - GRADE 3	60
TABLE 18	ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE OF THE WRITING SKILLS TEST - GRADE 3	61
TABLE 18A	TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS WRITING SKILLS - SPELLING - GRADE 3	62
TABLE 18B	TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS WRITING SKILLS - GRAMMAR - GRADE 3	62
TABLE 18C	TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS WRITING SKILLS - VOCABULARY - GRADE 3	63
TABLE 18D	TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS WRITING SKILLS - COMMUNICATION - GRADE 3	63
TABLE 18E	TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS WRITING SKILLS - AVERAGE TOTAL - GRADE 3	64
TABLE 19	ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE OF ORAL PRODUCTION MEASURES - GRADE 3	64
TABLE 19A	TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS ORAL PRODUCTION - PRONUNCIATION - GRADE 3	66
TABLE 19B	TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS ORAL PRODUCTION - GRAMMAR - GRADE 3	66
TABLE 19C	TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS ORAL PRODUCTION - VOCABULARY - GRADE 3	67
TABLE 19D	TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS ORAL PRODUCTION - COMMUNICATION - GRADE 3	67
TABLE 19E	TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS ORAL PRODUCTION - AVERAGE TOTAL - GRADE 3	68
TABLE 20	ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE OF THE RESULTS OF THE TEST DE FRANÇAIS DU MANITOBA - GRADE 6	69
TABLE 20A	TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS TEST DE FRANÇAIS - VOCABULAIRE - GRADE 6	70
TABLE 20B	TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS TEST DE FRANÇAIS - ORTHOGRAPHE, PONCTUATION ET MAJUSCULES - GRADE 6	70
TABLE 20C	TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS TEST DE FRANÇAIS - GRAMMAIRE - GRADE 6	71

		PAGE
TABLE 20D	TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS TEST DE FRANÇAIS - LECTURE SILENCIEUSE - GRADE 6	71
TABLE 21	ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE OF THE RESULTS ON THE CLOZE AND AURAL COMPREHENSION TESTS - GRADE 6	73
TABLE 21A	TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS CLOZE TEST - GRADE 6	73
TABLE 21B	TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS AURAL COMPREHENSION - GRADE 6	74
TABLE 22	ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE OF THE RESULTS ON THE WRITING SKILLS TEST - GRADE 6	74
TABLE 22A	TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS WRITING SKILLS - SPELLING - GRADE 6	75
TABLE 22B	TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS WRITING SKILLS - GRAMMAR - GRADE 6	76
TABLE 22C	TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS WRITING SKILLS - VOCABULARY - GRADE 6	76
TABLE 22D	TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS WRITING SKILLS - COMMUNICATION - GRADE 6	77
TABLE 22E	TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS WRITING SKILLS - AVERAGE TOTAL - GRADE 6	77
TABLE 23	ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE OF THE RESULTS OF THE ORAL PRODUCTION TEST - GRADE 6	78
TABLE 23A	TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS ORAL PRODUCTION - PRONUNCIATION - GRADE 6	79
TABLE 23B	TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS ORAL PRODUCTION - GRAMMAR - GRADE 6	79
TABLE 23C	TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS ORAL PRODUCTION - VOCABULARY - GRADE 6	80
TABLE 23D	TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS ORAL PRODUCTION - AVERAGE TOTAL - GRADE 6	80
TABLE 24	ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE OF THE RESULTS ON THE TEST DE FRANÇAIS DU MANITOBA - GRADE 9	81
TABLE 24A	TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS TEST DE FRANÇAIS - VOCABULAIRE - GRADE 9	82
TABLE 24B	TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS TEST DE FRANÇAIS - ORTHOGRAPHE, PONCTUATION ET MAJUSCULES - GRADE 9	82

		PAGE
TABLE 24C	TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS TEST DE FRANÇAIS - GRAMMAIRE - GRADE 9	83
TABLE 24D	TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS TEST DE FRANÇAIS - LECTURE SILENCIEUSE - GRADE 9	83
TABLE 25	ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE OF THE RESULTS ON THE CLOZE AND AURAL COMPREHENSION TESTS GRADE 9	84
TABLE 25A	TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS CLOZE TEST - GRADE 9	84
TABLE 25B	TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS AURAL COMPREHENSION - GRADE 9	85
TABLE 26	ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE OF WRITING SKILLS TEST RESULTS - GRADE 9	86
TABLE 26A	TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS WRITING SKILLS - SPELLING - GRADE 9	86
TABLE 26B	TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS WRITING SKILLS - GRAMMAR - GRADE 9	87
TABLE 26C	TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS WRITING SKILLS - VOCABULARY - GRADE 9	87
TABLE 26D	TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS WRITING SKILLS - COMMUNICATION - GRADE 9	88
TABLE 26E	TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS WRITING SKILLS - AVERAGE TOTAL - GRADE 9	88
TABLE 27	ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE OF THE ORAL PRODUCTION TEST RESULTS - GRADE 9	89
TABLE 27A	TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS ORAL PRODUCTION - PRONUNCIATION - GRADE 9	90
TABLE 27B	TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS ORAL PRODUCTION - GRAMMAR - GRADE 9	90
TABLE 27C	TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS ORAL PRODUCTION - VOCABULARY - GRADE 9	91
TABLE 27D	TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS ORAL PRODUCTION - AVERAGE TOTAL - GRADE 9	91
TABLE 28	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF INDICES, BY GROUP - GRADE 3	93
TABLE 29	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF INDICES, BY GROUP - GRADE 6	94

		PAGE
TABLE 30	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF INDICES, BY GROUP - GRADE 9	94
TABLE 31	STUDENTS' PERCEPTION OF THEIR USE OF FRENCH, BY GROUP - GRADE 3	97
TABLE 32	STUDENTS' PERCEPTION OF THEIR USE OF FRENCH, BY GROUP - GRADE 6	98
TABLE 33	STUDENTS' PERCEPTION OF THEIR USE OF FRENCH, BY GROUP - GRADE 9	99
TABLE 34	STUDENTS' DECISION TO CONTINUE IN THE FRENCH IMMERSION PROGRAMME AND REASONS, BY GROUP - GRADE 3	101
TABLE 35	STUDENTS' DECISION TO CONTINUE IN THE FRENCH IMMERSION PROGRAMME AND REASONS, BY GROUP - GRADE 6	102
TABLE 36	STUDENTS' DECISION TO CONTINUE IN THE FRENCH IMMERSION PROGRAMME AND REASONS, BY GROUP - GRADE 9	103
TABLE 36A	REASONS GIVEN BY STUDENTS WHO DO NOT WANT TO CONTINUE IN THE FRENCH IMMERSION PROGRAMME - GRADE 9	104
TABLE 37	STUDENTS' PARTICIPATION IN ACTIVITIES HELD IN FRENCH, BY GROUP AND BY GRADE	105
TABLE 38	PARENTAL ATTITUDES, BY GROUP - GRADE 3	108
TABLE 39	PARENTAL ATTITUDES, BY GROUP - GRADE 6	109
TABLE 40	PARENTAL ATTITUDES, BY GROUP - GRADE 9	110
TABLE 41	PERCENTAGE OF PARENTS WHOSE CHILD HAS PARTICIPATED IN ACTIVITIES IN FRENCH AND IMPORTANCE OF ACTIVITIES, BY GRADE	112
TABLE 42	PARENTS' PERCEPTION OF THEIR CHILD'S PARTICIPATION IN ACTIVITIES, BY GROUP GRADE 3	113
TABLE 43	PARENTS' PERCEPTION OF THEIR CHILD'S PARTICIPATION IN ACTIVITIES, BY GROUP GRADE 6	114
TABLE 44	PARENTS' PERCEPTION OF THEIR CHILD'S PARTICIPATION IN ACTIVITIES, BY GROUP GRADE 9	114

		PAGE
TABLE 45	PARENTS' SATISFACTION WITH CHILD'S FRENCH IMMERSION PROGRAMME, BY GROUP AND GRADE	116
TABLE 46	PARENTS' DECISION TO ENROLL THEIR CHILD IN FRENCH IMMERSION AND LEVEL ANTICIPATED BY GROUP - GRADE 3	116
TABLE 47	PARENTS' DECISION TO ENROLL THEIR CHILD IN FRENCH IMMERSION AND LEVEL ANTICIPATED, BY GROUP - GRADE 6	117
TABLE 48	PARENTS' DECISION TO ENROLL THEIR CHILD IN FRENCH IMMERSION AND LEVEL ANTICIPATED, BY GROUP - GRADE 9	117
TABLE 49	STUDENTS' MODE OF TRANSPORTATION AND PARENTAL SATISFACTION, BY GROUP - GRADE 3	119
TABLE 50	STUDENTS' MODE OF TRANSPORTATION AND PARENTAL SATISFACTION, BY GROUP - GRADE 6	120
TABLE 51	STUDENTS' MODE OF TRANSPORTATION AND PARENTAL SATISFACTION, BY GROUP - GRADE 9	120
TABLE 52	TEACHING EXPERIENCE, BY SETTING	121
TABLE 53	AVERAGE NUMBER OF YEARS' TEACHING EXPERIENCE, BY LEVEL, PROGRAMME AND SETTING	122
TABLE 54	LANGUAGE MEDIUM OF INSTRUCTION, BY LEVEL AND SETTING	123
TABLE 55	SELF-REPORTED TEACHER TRAINING, BY PROGRAMME, SUBJECT, SETTING AND LEVEL	125
TABLE 56	SELF-REPORTED FORMAL STUDIES, BY PROGRAMME, SUBJECT, SETTING AND LEVEL	126
TABLE 57	SELF-REPORTED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT, BY PROGRAMME, SUBJECT, SETTING AND LEVEL	127
TABLE 58	SELF-REPORTED EXPERIENCES SAID TO HAVE INCREASED FRENCH LANGUAGE COMPETENCY, BY SETTING	128
TABLE 59	TEACHERS' EVALUATION OF CURRICULUM GUIDES, BY SUBJECT AND SETTING	129
TABLE 60	TEACHERS' EVALUATION OF TEXTBOOKS, BY SUBJECT AND SETTING	131

		PAGE
TABLE 61	TEACHERS' EVALUATION OF BACKUP RESOURCES AVAILABLE, BY SETTING	133
TABLE 62	TEACHERS' PERCEPTION OF THE USE OF FRENCH IN MATERIALS DISPLAYED OR IN SCHOOL EVENTS, BY SETTING	134
TABLE 63	TEACHERS' PERCEPTION OF USE OF THE FRENCH LANGUAGE BY STUDENTS, BY SETTING	135
TABLE 64	TEACHERS' PERCEPTION OF PARENTS' REASONS FOR ENROLLING THEIR CHILD IN THE FRENCH IMMERSION PROGRAMME, BY SETTING	136
TABLE 65	ADMINISTRATIVE EXPERIENCE OF PRINCIPALS, BY TYPE OF SCHOOL AND SETTING	137
TABLE 66	LANGUAGE USED AS MEDIUM OF INSTRUCTION DURING PRINCIPALS' EDUCATION, BY SETTING	138
TABLE 67	PRINCIPALS' PERCEPTION OF FRENCH USAGE IN THE SCHOOL, BY SETTING	139
TABLE 68	PRINCIPALS' PERCEPTION OF ADMINISTRATIVE AREAS CREATING MORE DIFFICULTY IN THE IMMERSION PROGRAMME, BY SETTING	142

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report presents the results of a research project conducted during the 1979-1980 school year on French immersion programmes in Manitoba.

The authors are indebted to Dr. Sharon Lapkin and the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, and to Ms Ellen Adiv and the Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal, for sharing their experience and testing instruments. The authors would like to thank Dr. Lapkin and Dr. Jim Cummins who read and commented on an earlier draft of this report.

We also wish to thank the members of the Advisory Committee of school board and Department of Education officials for their participation and continued support during the entire project. The authors gratefully acknowledge the contribution of the parents and school board officials who participated in the collection of the data presented in this report: the contact persons who coordinated the data collection in each school division, the test and questionnaire administrators, the principals and the teachers. Finally, we wish to express our special thanks to the students who participated in this project. Without their assistance and cooperation, this study would not have been possible.

FOREWORD

This research report is the result of a lengthy process. Two years ago, many school divisions were becoming aware of the need to obtain data on the basis of which they could develop policies regarding their immersion programme, the physical setting, the grouping of students, etc. In some school divisions, the first cohorts of students in the early immersion programme were at the secondary level; late immersion programmes had been started. Other school divisions were initiating immersion programmes and the demand was increasing. At the request of the Bureau de l'éducation française of the Department of Education, all school divisions answered a short questionnaire regarding their research needs. The results were discussed at several meetings of representatives of school divisions which were offering or planning to offer immersion programmes. Once they had agreed on the objectives of a research project, an Advisory Committee was created.

The Department of Education was represented by Dr. Ronald Duhamel, assistant deputy minister, Mr. Normand Boisvert and Mr. Ernest Molgat, all of the Bureau de l'éducation française, and either Mr. Mike Yakimishyn, Dr. Neil Russell, Dr. Joy Thompson or Mr. Dan Haughey of the Research Branch.

The school divisions were represented on the Advisory Committee by Mr. Jean Beaumont of the Division scolaire de la Rivière Seine, Mr. John Ilavsky of the St. Vital School Division, Mr. Roger Millier of the Division scolaire de Saint-Boniface and Mr. Willem Steur of the Winnipeg School Division.

The Advisory Committee worked in consultation with representatives of other school divisions and with the researchers. It was responsible for accepting or rejecting all tests and questionnaires suggested by the researchers. It also selected the target and comparative group populations. The Advisory Committee reviewed all drafts of the questionnaires and approved the final version. The researchers are indebted to the committee members for their cooperation, and for devoting time to the project and sharing their experience.

While the Advisory Committee was responsible for decisions regarding the population, the instruments and the procedures for test and questionnaire administration, the researchers are responsible for the analysis of the data, the interpretations and the conclusions presented in this report.

ABSTRACT

French Immersion Programmes in Manitoba: An Evaluation

In recent years, French immersion programmes have become increasingly popular in Manitoba. The expansion of these programmes requires major policy decisions by school divisions and the Department of Education. While the results of research conducted in Ontario and Québec have been positive, very little evaluation has been undertaken to determine whether these results are applicable in Manitoba. The purpose of this study is to evaluate immersion programmes in this province.

In this study, achievement in French and English language skills and in mathematics is compared among groups of immersion students in grades 3, 6 and 9. Comparisons are also made between these groups of immersion students and a sample of students whose mother tongue is French. Different types of programmes (early and late, total and partial) offered in different settings (English and Immersion) are considered in the study. The parents, teachers and principals of students in the study answered questionnaires to provide additional information on French immersion programmes in Manitoba.

The study indicates that French immersion students perform as well as, or better than, the national norms in English and mathematics. French immersion programmes have no negative effects on

achievement in those subjects. In French language achievement and proficiency, the early total immersion programme in an Immersion setting produces the best results. The type of programme and the setting influence French language development: students in an Immersion setting and in a total immersion programme obtain higher scores than those in an English setting or in a partial immersion programme.

I - INTRODUCTION

Over the past ten years, a variety of French immersion programmes has been introduced in Manitoba. While the programmes varied according to type (early or late, total or partial) and setting (immersion schools or immersion centres in English or French schools), they were generally modelled on existing programmes in Ontario and Québec.

French immersion programmes have become increasingly popular in Manitoba as elsewhere. To accommodate this expansion, policy decisions are required by the school divisions offering these programmes and by the Department of Education. Before making these decisions, the divisions and the Department decided it was essential to evaluate the existing programmes in the province.

Careful evaluation in Ontario and Québec suggests that the immersion approach to learning a second language is highly successful. However, a recurring question arises as further expansion of immersion programmes is contemplated: are the positive results and interpretations from other provinces applicable to Manitoba's French immersion programmes? Since very little research has been undertaken in Manitoba, there is an urgent need to assess results obtained elsewhere in light of the conditions prevailing in this province.

This report is an attempt to provide some of the answers to these questions. It presents a first evaluation of French immersion programmes in Manitoba. The data were collected in May and June, 1980, in all schools offering French immersion programmes at the grade 3, 6 and 9 levels.

Chapter II presents a selected review of the literature upon which this research is based. It focuses on achievement in English and mathematics, proficiency in French, and the motivation and attitudes of students enrolled in French immersion programmes of different types and offered in different settings.

The third chapter presents the major objectives and the limitations of the research. Chapter IV describes the groups involved in the research project: the target and comparative student populations, the parents, the teachers and the principals. The presentation of tests and questionnaires follows, including the identification of the standardized tests, and the method used in the construction, pretest and scoring of the other measurement instruments. The schedules and procedures used in the data collection complete this chapter.

Chapter V presents, first, the students' results on the academic achievement tests and on the French proficiency tests. The responses obtained on the students' and parents' questionnaires follow. An analysis of the teachers' and principals' questionnaires complete this chapter.

The final chapter summarizes the results of the study and identifies some of its implications.

II - REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The success of immersion programmes in which English-speaking students receive their instruction in French was recognized in St. Lambert, Québec, in 1965. For several years, careful evaluation was conducted by a research team headed by Dr. Wallace E. Lambert of McGill University (see Lambert and Tucker, 1972).

By 1976 (see Swain for bibliography and review), French immersion programmes had been introduced in all major cities in Canada and a considerable number of evaluations and research projects had been completed. Most of these had been conducted in the Montréal and Ottawa areas where immersion programmes were widespread and varied.

Swain (1974) points out that French immersion programmes have many common aspects, although they do vary. She identifies four major questions which research on French immersion programmes had addressed until then. They are:

"1) How do the English language skills of students in French immersion classes fare relative to those of students in regular English classes? relative to those of students in partial French immersion classes?

2) What are the consequences of introducing English reading prior to, concurrently with, or subsequent to the introduction of French reading in early immersion classes?

3) Are the French language skills of students in total immersion classes superior to those of students in partial immersion classes? to those of students taking daily periods of French as a second language?

4) Is the learning of subject material taught via the medium of a second language slowed down to any measurable extent?"

Since Swain's article, other questions have been addressed by researchers. These include:

5) How does the school setting influence achievement results and the attitudes of students?

6) How do school programme factors influence cognitive development?

7) What is the relationship between socio-cultural factors, linguistic abilities, motivation, attitudes and achievement?

8) What is the relationship between teachers' and principals' characteristics and French immersion programmes and type of setting?

The superior performance of French immersion students in French language skills when compared to students receiving the traditional instruction in French as a second language has been repeatedly demonstrated (Halpern et al, 1976; Stern et al, 1976; Edwards et al, 1976a and 1976b). Although the French language skills of students in French immersion programmes in different settings have been measured by various instruments, the conclusions are similar. French immersion students demonstrate better French language skills than do students in a traditional French-as-a-second-language programme.

This selected review of the literature deals with the performance of French immersion students compared to students in regular English programmes, in English and other subject matters, and within-group comparisons for all other areas.

English Language Skills

Although there seems to be a general consensus on the value of early immersion and a desire to take advantage of the young child's ability to learn a second language, parents and educators are concerned about the effect of French immersion programmes on the development of the student's English language skills.

This concern is indicated by the year in which reading in the native and the second languages is introduced. A number of different programmes have been established. The major difference is that one type introduces reading in English in grade 1 and reading in French in grade 2. The second type introduces reading in French in grade 1 and formal instruction of English Language Arts, which includes reading, in grade 2 or 3 and sometimes as late as grade 4.

The results of various studies can be summed up as follows:

1) Students completing French immersion kindergarten perform as well on the Metropolitan Readiness test as students enrolled in a regular English programme (Barik and Swain, 1975). The measures compared were the readiness for reading and arithmetic.

2) Students who have been enrolled in total French immersion programmes fall behind in reading skills in English when compared to their counterparts in regular English programmes. Even though their listening and speaking skills are similar, the French immersion students catch up only when formal instruction in English is introduced. There seems to be some lag in certain areas of English language

skills. However, one study indicates that students in a total French immersion programme out-perform students in a regular English programme (Swain 1978b).

Barik and Swain (1975) indicate that, at the end of grade 1, students in a total French immersion programme do not perform as well as students in a regular English programme in basic English language skills such as word knowledge, word discrimination and reading. Immersion students are at about the fortieth percentile, suggesting that there is a transfer of skills before the formal introduction of English Language Arts at the beginning of grade 2. By the end of grade 2, the lag in English language skills disappears except for spelling in English. These findings corroborate the results obtained by Lambert and Tucker (1972) in the St. Lambert project.

Edwards and Casserly (1976a) report on the evaluation of students in a French immersion programme in which English Language Arts is introduced at the beginning of grade 3. They indicate that the comparative group enrolled in an English programme with 75 minutes of instruction in French a day performed better on the English word knowledge, word discrimination, reading and spelling subtests of the Metropolitan Achievement tests than the French immersion group. However, the following year (i.e. 1972-1973), at the mid-year of grade 3, the same cohort of French immersion students performed as well as students enrolled in the 75-minute programme. With the exception of English language skills of the Canadian Tests of Basic Skills, there was no significant difference in the reading, vocabulary, work study skills, mathematics or composite scores.

Swain (1974) indicates that the results of the Roslyn Report of the Protestant School Board of Greater Montréal suggest "that lack of exposure to formal English studies until grade four does not adversely affect a student's capacity to master grade four English skills when introduced at that level".

Overall, total French immersion programmes, in which English Language Arts is introduced at either the grade 1, 2, 3 or 4 levels, do not seem to have adverse effects on English language skills. Shortly after the English Language Arts course is introduced, the English skills are more or less equivalent to matched cohorts (for I.Q., socio-economic status and age) of students in regular English programmes.

The partial French immersion programme differs from the total French immersion programme in that, during approximately half the day, French is the language of instruction, and during the other half English is used. The kindergarten year is either in English or in French or both. During subsequent years, the subjects taught in either language may vary from one school to another. However, the amount of time during which each language is used as the medium of instruction remains approximately the same.

The major studies of French immersion involve two programmes. The first programme includes almost all students in the Ottawa Roman Catholic Separate School Board. The evaluations were published by Edwards et al (1976a, 1976b). The second programme involves only one class at each level in Elgin County, Ontario. The details of the evaluations can be found in Barik and Swain (1974, 1976a, 1976b, 1977, 1978a).

The results of early partial immersion students on standardized English language skills tests are similar to those found for early total immersion students. Even though students in the partial immersion programme received half of their instruction in English, they did not perform better than the total immersion groups which received an hour of English a day. The confounding factor to which little attention has been given in past research is that, by the grade 5 level, most total early immersion programmes are in partial immersion, i.e., half of the day is in English while the other half is in French. Thus comparisons between the early total French immersion and the early partial French immersion programmes at those levels should be interpreted accordingly.

The late French immersion programmes differ even more than the early French immersion programmes. In the Protestant School Board of Greater Montréal, approximately 85% of the initial year of French immersion (usually grade 7 or grade 8) is given in French and 15% in English Language Arts. In the following years, students are encouraged to spend approximately 40% of their instruction time in French. These students had had French second language courses in elementary school (Genesee et al, 1977). The results of this longitudinal study indicate that the late immersion programme at the secondary level did not have any detrimental effect on English language skills. Similiar results were found in the Peel County Board of Education with grade 8 students.

French Language Skills

As previously indicated, numerous studies have shown that students in French immersion programmes score significantly better on French language tests than do students in regular French second-language programmes.

The results of early immersion programmes (total or partial) tend to indicate that there is a positive relationship between the amount of time spent in French and French language skills (Swain, 1978a). Thus, for example, a student in a grade 3 partial French immersion programme performs as well as a student at a grade 1.5 level in a total French immersion programme.

Other comparisons at higher grade levels (e.g., early total immersion students now in a partial immersion programme at the grade 7 level, with late immersion students following 85% of the programme in French) are of doubtful validity. Since these types of comparison involve different percentages of instruction time in French, other factors come into play.

French Immersion Programmes and Cognitive Development

Studies carried out in the first half of this century on the relationship between intelligence or cognitive development and bilingualism suggested that it is negative. This issue has been debated many times. However, as reported by Peal and Lambert (1962), several of the previous studies did not take into account differences in variables such as socio-economic status.

Recent studies have been conducted since the introduction of French immersion programmes in Canada. Several investigators have found positive relationships between bilingualism and various aspects of cognitive development. These studies have usually been based on a single measure, whereas Barik and Swain (1976c) have measured I.Q. over a period of five years. They indicate that the observed differences between I.Q. scores obtained by French immersion and regular English programme students were due to initial differences. However, further analysis of their data provides support for Cummins' threshold hypothesis. Cummins (1976) postulates that there is a threshold level of competence in the second language which must be attained. Reaching this level has a double effect. Cummins suggests that students must attain it in order to avoid cognitive disadvantages and also to allow "the potentially beneficial aspects of becoming bilingual to influence their cognitive functioning". Barik and Swain (1976c) indicate that the students who scored higher on French language proficiency measures also demonstrated increases in I.Q. measures.

Genesee (1976a and b) indicates that, although I.Q. is related to achievement in a second language, just as it is related to achievement in the native language, "all evidence, direct and indirect, suggests that the level of I.Q. is not an impediment to achievement in French immersion programmes any more than it is in a regular academic programme in the native language" (p.512). Furthermore, Genesee (1979) concludes from a review of research

findings of studies of the French immersion programmes of the Protestant School Board of Greater Montréal that I.Q. is not related to functional competence in speaking and understanding French. Below average students in early total immersion programmes acquire these skills to the same extent as average and above average students in these programmes.

Cummins (1979), reviewing several studies in which correlations between I.Q. and aptitude and achievement tests in the students' native and second languages were examined, concludes that the acquisition of a second language is much more related to competence in the native language when the second language is introduced.

The Setting

Many aspects of French immersion programmes have been studied by various investigators. However, not until the study by Lapkin and Swain (1979, in press) has an in-depth investigation of the setting been reported.

Lapkin and Swain define the immersion centre as a school in which only the French immersion programme is offered. The dual-track school is defined as one in which a regular English programme is offered as well as a French immersion programme.

The authors report that the achievement results suggest that there is an immersion centre phenomenon. Using I.Q. as the covariate, students in immersion centres, compared to dual-track students, demonstrated a superior performance in French and English

measures. There was no evidence that these two groups were suffering in relation to regular English programme students.

Lapkin and Swain interpret the superior performance of students in immersion centres on French listening and reading comprehension measures as the result of various factors in the school environment.

Having collected data from parents, teachers, principals and students, Lapkin and Swain conclude that "the overall implication of this study for programme planning is to focus on teachers' needs in materials and resources, and to encourage the maximum use of French in the school setting, whether it be an immersion centre or a dual-track school".

Attitudes and Motivation in Second-Language Learning

Since the publication of the book by Gardner and Lambert (1972), several studies have been undertaken on attitudes and motivation in second-language learning. Both English native language students in French immersion programmes (Clément et al, 1977b; Gardner et al, 1975, 1976; Hamayan et al, 1977) and French native language students learning English (Clément et al, 1977a) have been target populations for the evaluation of motivation and attitudes related to language proficiency.

In addition to the original characteristics of instrumental and integrative motivation, a number of additional variables have been studied.

These include French classroom anxiety, attitudes to French Canadians, interest in foreign languages, integrativeness, instrumentality, parental encouragement, attitudes to European French people, attitudes to learning French, desire to learn French and motivational intensity (see Clément et al, 1977a, for definitions).

Results from the Language Research Group at the University of Western Ontario indicate that the integrative motive is as important as language aptitude in second-language acquisition because it determines how well a student learns the language and is positively related to the student's decision to continue studying the language. The integrative motive is a complex structure of attitudinal and motivational variables. Gardner and Smythe (1975) argue that, because the teachers and the school system can influence these factors, it is important that attention be given to them in developing activities and programmes.

III - RESEARCH OBJECTIVES AND LIMITATIONS

As previously indicated, school divisions and the Department of Education are faced with major policy decisions. Research in Ontario and Québec has indicated that French immersion programmes are very effective in teaching a second language without any long-term negative consequences on first language development and achievement in other subjects. However, there are two major differences between immersion programmes in these two provinces and Manitoba. First, early total immersion programmes in Manitoba continue to the end of grade 6 with approximately 75% of the instruction time in French. In programmes offered in Montréal and Ottawa, at the grades 5 and 6 levels, approximately half of the instruction time is in English and the other half in French. Secondly, the proportion of the population whose mother tongue is French is much greater in these two cities. Because of the greater number of French-speaking people, socio-cultural factors would appear to be quite different and could have different consequences on the learning of French as a second language.

The major objectives of this research are, first, the evaluation of achievement in English and mathematics. The results of French immersion students are compared to Canadian norms. The second objective is the evaluation of French-language achievement and proficiency. The results are compared to French-speaking students in Français schools.

The research population consists of students at the end of each of the first three cycles of the public school programme, i.e. at the end of grades 3, 6 and 9. They are enrolled in different

French immersion programmes (total or partial, early or late) in different settings (English or Immersion). French achievement and French language proficiency results are also compared to determine differences within the French immersion programme.

For the purposes of this research, the following definitions apply:

Total immersion: programme with instruction in French ranging from 74% to 81% of the total time

Partial immersion: programme with instruction in French ranging from 39% to 61% of the total time

Early immersion: programme in which students begin French immersion in kindergarten

Late immersion: programme in which students begin French immersion in grade 7

English setting: school offering both the French immersion programme and the regular English programme with one administration responsible for both programmes

Immersion setting: school offering only the French immersion programme or the French immersion programme and a regular English programme. However, the French immersion programme is in one section of the school building with different administrators, teachers and recreation time.

The general question which summarizes the research objectives is: which French immersion programme offered in which setting produces the best results in English language development and other subjects, and in French language proficiency?

In order to explain various differences observed between groups, data gathered from pupils, parents, teachers and principals are considered. These data, which could be termed "soft", include attitudes, expectations, experiences and policies.

Two covariates are used for comparisons within the French immersion groups: intelligence quotient and socio-economic status.

The major limitation of this research is the unequal number of students in each group and the unequal number of classes within each group. Even though the total Manitoban immersion population at the three grade levels was considered, the number of students in each type of programme by setting varies widely. Great care was taken to correct for unequal "n"'s in cells by statistical procedures. However, when reading this report, one must always remember that some groups have very small numbers of students. Secondly, especially at the grade 9 level, the nature of the selection for the immersion programme could influence the composition of the classes.

In conclusion, attempts have been made to correct for these limitations, either by statistical analysis or by the interpretation of the results.

IV - RESEARCH METHOD

A) Subjects

All French immersion students enrolled in early or late (secondary) French immersion programmes at the grades 3, 6 and 9 levels were selected for the evaluation. A total of 521 students in eleven schools and seven school divisions were the initial target population (Table 1).

At each grade level, four classes of Français students whose mother tongue is French were used as the comparative group. The schools were selected to meet the following criteria: a) the maximum amount of French permissible by law was taught, b) all the students within the school were enrolled in the Français programme and c) there was an equal number of rural and urban classes. If, within these schools, there was more than one class at any given level, the choice of class was made randomly.

TABLE 1

TOTAL POPULATION INVOLVED IN THE STUDY, BY GRADE LEVEL

Type / Grade	Immersion Students	Comparative Group	Parents	Teachers	Principals and vice-principals
3	278	117	175	103	13
6	141	94	68		
9	102	80	48		
Total	521	291	291	103	13

The parent population consisted of parents of all immersion students. Of a possible total of 521, 291 (56%) parents' questionnaires were completed. Furthermore, 103 (86%) teachers and 13 (100%) principals completed questionnaires.

B) Tests and Questionnaires

a) Student school experience

The student school experience questionnaire was completed for each student by the school principal's office. The information gathered includes the type of school setting and the type of programme followed by the student during the previous three years. The questionnaire also seeks information on the introduction of English Language Arts and reading in French (see Appendix I).

b) The Canadian Test of Basic Skills

This widely used test battery is designed to evaluate the skills necessary for educational development.

Four subtests were administered to the grade 3 and 6 students. Two of them measure skills in the English language: Vocabulary and Reading Comprehension. The other two, Concepts and Problem Solving, measure skills in mathematics.

c) Stanford Task Level I

This test is part of the Stanford Achievement test battery. It is commonly used in some school divisions in Manitoba.

Two subtests were administered to the grade 9 students: English and mathematics.

The school divisions administered the tests, corrected them and forwarded the raw scores, percentiles and grade equivalents (in grades 3 and 6) of each student to the researchers.

d) Test de Français du Manitoba (second edition)

This standardized achievement test was originally designed for students whose mother tongue is French. It measures basic skills grouped in four subtests: Vocabulary; Spelling, Punctuation and Capitalization; Grammar; and Silent Reading. It is a progressive battery extending from grade 3 to grade 9. It has been used successfully in immersion classes at all levels.

The four subtests at the appropriate levels were administered in grades 3, 6 and 9 by the school divisions who then forwarded the answer sheets to the researchers for scoring.

e) The Cloze tests

The three Cloze tests were developed by the Protestant School Board of Greater Montréal.

In grade 3, the title of the text is "Un lundi comme les autres", in grade 6, "Mireille Mathieu, un mignon petit bout de femme", and in grade 9, "Capitale mondiale de l'orchidée".

The completed tests were scored by the researchers. Four scores were obtained: E, the total exact response; EE, the total exact response and the total exact response with spelling errors;

EEA, the total exact response (without or with errors) and the total acceptable synonym without spelling errors; and EEAE, the total exact response and the total acceptable response (without or with errors).

f) The Aural Comprehension test

At the grade 3 level, the Test de compréhension auditive [1] is a paper-and-pencil test in which short sentences are dictated to the students. They must select one drawing from a four-drawing pictorial strip which describes what they have just heard.

At the grade 6 and 9 levels, two different tests were prepared by the research staff. These included short passages dealing with a variety of topics. Short questions were asked after each one was read. The objective of each question was to measure the student's aural comprehension.

For the grades 6 and 9 aural comprehension tests, the first versions were pretested at the grade 5 level (for the grade 6 test) and at the grade 8 level (for the grade 9 test) in French immersion and Français classes. Of the first version, only the items having a discrimination index of .30 or more were retained for the final version used in this research.

---

[1] The authors would like to thank Ms Ellen Adiv and the Protestant School Board of Greater Montréal for permission to use their test.

g) Writing skills

At each grade level, a pictorial strip with content appropriate for the student's age was presented. The students were asked to describe the story suggested by the pictures and to tell what the characters were thinking. There was no time limit nor was there a limit on the length of the written story. The test administrators were not allowed to translate words nor were the students allowed to use a dictionary. The average testing session was expected to last approximately 20 minutes.

Before the writing samples were scored, all identification of the student was removed and a number was assigned. The writing samples were scored twice by different evaluators, and the final score on the four scales[1] was the average of the scores given by the evaluators. The evaluators' mother tongue is French and they were trained in the use of the scoring scales by a linguist[2].

h) Non-verbal intelligence test

The Non-Language Multi-Mental Test by Terman, McCall and Lorge was administered to the grades 3 and 6 students. At the grade 9 level, the "Reasoning" test by Jean Courval was administered.

Both non-verbal tests were scored by the researchers.

---

[1] See Appendix 2 for details of the scales.

[2] M. Raymond Thêberge, a linguist, acted as consultant to this research project.

i) Oral Production test

The oral production test consisted of an oral interview, and an oral narration. The test was designed to compare the groups on five linguistic measures: comprehension, pronunciation, grammar and syntax, vocabulary and communication.

The oral interview consisted of a series of questions dealing with topics of general interest: school, sports, hobbies, camping, etc. This part of the test simulated a communicative situation. The test administrators were trained in asking questions.

The oral narration consisted of a presentation of a pictorial strip to the student who then related the story to the test administrator. The interview and the narration were recorded on tape.

The oral samples were scored by a linguist[1]. The scoring was based on a series of scales. The interview and the narration were scored separately, and the final score is the average of the two scores. The scores are for comparative purposes and for within group comparisons.

j) The student questionnaire

The student questionnaires were developed by the researchers. After several versions had been reviewed by the Advisory Committee, the last draft was pretested. The sample used for the

---

[1] M. Raymond Théberge scored all oral samples. For details of the scales used, see Appendix 2.

grade 3 questionnaire was two grade 4 classes. For the grades 6 and 9 questionnaire, two grade 7 classes were selected. The purpose of the pretest was primarily to verify the level of vocabulary and the precision of the directions.

The content of the questionnaires included various attitudinal and motivational variables, the students' perception of their use of French and contacts in French, their intentions to pursue their studies in the French immersion programme and their extracurricular activities.

The questionnaires were coded by the researchers. The two questionnaires are reproduced in Appendix 3.

k) The teachers' and principals' questionnaires

These questionnaires were based on the Teacher Survey and Principal's Survey developed by the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.[1] The researchers adapted some of the questions so that they would correspond to the target population.

The teachers' questionnaire sought detailed information about teaching experience, teacher training, professional development activities, as well as the availability and suitability of resources, various aspects of the teachers' language background, and their satisfaction with the immersion programme. Questions

---

[1] The researchers wish to acknowledge and thank Dr. Sharon Lapkin and the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education for their assistance with the teacher and principal questionnaires.

dealing with the use of French in the school, parental expectations and concerns, and their choice of teaching situation are also included. This part of the teacher questionnaire was to be completed by all teachers who teach French immersion students.

Section B of the teacher questionnaire was addressed to homeroom teachers. The questions dealt primarily with information on students and the physical arrangements of the classroom.

An additional short questionnaire was addressed to all French Language Arts teachers of the French immersion programme. It included three questions, the first dealing with methodology, the second with objectives and the third with special activities.

The principals' questionnaire contained many of the questions in the teacher questionnaire, as well as some questions relating to the administration of the French immersion programme.

The questionnaires are reproduced in Appendix 4.

1) The parents' questionnaire

This questionnaire seeks information on the family (e.g. children), the languages spoken at home, the parents' occupation and education, and family income. A number of questions on the attitudes and motivation of French immersion parents are followed by questions on satisfaction with the programme, the use of French, participation in activities held in French and reactions to transportation policy as it affects them.

The questionnaire is reproduced in Appendix 5.

C) Schedules and Procedures of Test and Questionnaire Administration

Each school division participating in the research project designated one person to liaise with the researchers. Since the school divisions were responsible for data gathering by means of tests and questionnaires for all but the Oral Production test, a detailed timetable was established.

The Student School Experience questionnaire, used for the selection of the student samples for the Oral Production test, was the first to be completed and returned to the researchers. It also served as the master file for all student information and results collected for this project. The Canadian Test of Basic Skills, the Stanford Task test and the Test de Français du Manitoba are standardized tests with which teachers have experience. No supplementary training was required.

However, since other tests and questionnaires were unknown to teachers, the school divisions designated the number of test administrators who would be required. The administrators received two training sessions from the researchers. The first was for the Cloze test, the Writing Skills test and the group intelligence test. The second training session included directives for the Aural Comprehension test and student questionnaires. Great care was taken to ensure that only the researchers had access to the completed student questionnaires, thus assuring students of the confidentiality of their responses.

The contact persons were responsible for the administration of the teachers' and principals' questionnaires; they also forwarded their school division's transportation policy to the researchers. Furthermore, the contact persons ensured that the parents of students at the grades 3, 6 and 9 levels received the questionnaires with a return envelope addressed to the researchers. Every effort was made to guarantee the confidentiality of student, teacher, principal and parent responses on their respective questionnaires.

V - PRESENTATION OF RESULTS

The first section of this chapter describes the student population and how groups were formed at each grade level. The second section deals with the correlations between the variables used for the socio-economic status index and how it was calculated. The following section presents the correlations between the covariates and the achievement results. These results are then presented for groups of students. The responses to the students', parents', teachers', and principals' questionnaires follow.

A) Descriptive Statistics of the Student Population

Table 2 presents the total target population and the actual student and parent populations included in the study.

TABLE 2

TOTAL TARGET POPULATION AND STUDENT AND PARENT POPULATION RETAINED FOR ANALYSIS, BY GRADE

Grade	Total target population	Student		Parent	
		Number retained	% of total	Number retained	% retained*
3	278	253	91.0	175	69.2
6	141	109	77.3	68	62.4
9	102	100	98.0	48	48.0
Total	521	462	88.7	291	63.0

* The percentage of parents retained is calculated by dividing the number of parents retained by the number of students retained, e.g. 175/253 = 69.2%.

Within the classes selected for this study, students had to meet one criterion, which depended on the grade, to be included in the analyses. At the grade 3 and 6 levels, they had to have been enrolled in the same type of programme during each of the previous three years. At the grade 9 level, the late immersion students had to have entered the programme in grade 7.

After either of these criteria was applied to the classes selected for the study, 91% of the grade 3 students and 77.3% of those in grade 6 were retained for analysis. The lower percentage in grade 6 reflects two factors: one class had transferred from a partial Français to a total French immersion programme, and the number of students who had transferred from other programmes (mainly from a partial Français programme) was greater at the grade 6 than at the grade 3 level. In grade 9, 98% of the students in the immersion classes remained in the population under study after the criterion established at that level had been applied.

Considering only the students who remained in the study after the appropriate criterion was applied, 63% of these students' parents returned a postal questionnaire. This percentage decreases with the grade level, from 69.2% at the grade 3 level to 48% at the grade 9 level.

Table 3 presents the number of classes tested by type of setting, by programme and by grade. It reveals three characteristics of the student population. First, there is no partial immersion class in an Immersion setting, but there are seven in an English setting. Second, there are sixteen total immersion classes in

an Immersion setting, but only two in an English setting. Third, at the grade 9 level, all five classes follow a partial immersion programme in an English setting.

TABLE 3

DISTRIBUTION OF CLASSES, BY SETTING, TYPE OF PROGRAMME AND GRADE

Setting / Grade	English setting		Immersion setting		Total
	total	partial	total	partial	
3 N° of classes	2	1	11	0	14
6 N° of classes	0	1	5	0	6
9 N° of classes	0	5	0	0	5
Total	2	7	16	0	25

The French immersion students in the English setting represent approximately one third (1/3) to two-fifths (2/5) of the total student population in these schools.

The small number of students in some groups is a major limitation of this research. If the 25 classes had been distributed equally in all types of settings and programmes, more varied comparisons would have been possible. The uneven distribution of the classes and the limited number of programmes impose a research limitation which reflects the present state of immersion programmes in Manitoba.

As indicated in chapter IV, four Français classes were selected at each grade level to form the French comparative group for results in the French proficiency tests.

Table 4 indicates how the French immersion student population has been divided into groups according to type of programme and setting.

TABLE 4

PERCENTAGE OF INSTRUCTION IN FRENCH, BY GROUP AND GRADE

GRADE 3

Group	1	2	3	4	5	6	French comparative
Average percentage of instruction in French	78	81	74	79	52	76	79
Number of students	56	62	82	20	19	14	117

GRADE 6

Group	1	2	3	4	French comparative
Average percentage of instruction in French	79	77	51	50	79
Number of students	38	41	18	12	94

GRADE 9

Group	1	2	3	French comparative
Average percentage of instruction in French	39	61	58	76
Number of students	14	15	71	80

In grade 3, six groups were established and are defined as follows:

Group 1) Total early immersion programme in an immersion school. Reading in English and French was introduced in grade 1. (56 students; the percentage of instruction in French is 78%)

Group 2) Total early immersion programme in an immersion school. Reading in French was introduced in grade 1, and reading in English, in grade 2. (62 students; the percentage of instruction in French is 81%)

Group 3) Total early immersion programme in an immersion school. Reading in English was introduced in grade 1, and reading in French, in grade 2. (82 students; the percentage of instruction in French is 74%)

Group 4) Total early immersion programme in an English setting. Reading in English was introduced in grade 1, and reading in French, in grade 2. (20 students; the percentage of instruction in French is 79%)

Group 5) Partial early immersion programme in an English setting. Reading in English was introduced in grade 1, and reading in French, in grade 2. (19 students; the percentage of instruction in French is 52%)

Group 6) Total early immersion programme in a Français school. Reading in English and French was introduced in grade 1. (14 students; the percentage of instruction in French is 76%)

In grade 6, four groups were established, and are defined as follows:

Group 1) Total early immersion programme in an immersion school. Reading in French was introduced in grade 1, and reading in English, in grade 2. (38 students; the percentage of instruction in French is 79%)

Group 2) Total early immersion programme in an immersion school. Reading in English was introduced in grade 1, and reading in French, in grade 2. (41 students; the percentage of instruction in French is 77%)

Group 3) Partial early immersion programme in an immersion school. Reading in English and French was introduced in grade 1. (18 students; the percentage of instruction in French is 51%)

Group 4) Partial early immersion programme in an English setting. Reading in English was introduced in grade 1, and reading in French, in grade 2. (12 students; the percentage of instruction in French is 50%)

At the grade 9 level, three groups were established and are defined as follows:

Group 1) Partial early immersion programme in an English setting. Reading in English was introduced in grade 1, and reading in French, in grade 2. (14 students; the percentage of instruction in French is 39%)

Group 2) Total early immersion, now in a partial immersion programme in an English setting. Reading in English was introduced in grade 1, and reading in French, in grade 2. (15 students; the percentage of instruction in French is 61%)

Group 3) Late partial immersion programme in an English setting. Programme started in grade 7. (71 students; the percentage of instruction in French is 58%)

The average percentage of instruction in French refers to the total time during which French is used as the language of instruction. Only religious studies and free periods are excluded from the calculation. For the total immersion programmes, the average percentage of instruction conducted in French varies from 74% to 81%. The percentage for partial immersion programmes at the grade 9 level varies more: it ranges from 39% to 61%.

There are substantial differences in the number of students in the groups. Three alternative approaches can be considered: eliminating the smaller groups from the analysis, randomly selecting equal numbers of students in each group, or including all students in the analysis. The third alternative was chosen; it consists of using all possible data from the actual population and correcting for differences in the numbers by using appropriate statistical techniques.

Table 5 presents the average age of the students by group and by grade. The age is presented in months between date of birth and May 31, 1980. Although there are some differences between groups, the analysis of variance was not significant at any grade level.

TABLE 5

AVERAGE AGE OF STUDENTS*, BY GROUP AND GRADE

GRADE 3

Group	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mean	106.4	107.5	106.9	106.4	110.2	107.9
Standard deviation	3.666	5.358	4.424	3.441	4.442	5.196

GRADE 6

Group	1	2	3	4
Mean	142.7	144.1	145.6	143.5
Standard deviation	4.612	6.545	6.128	3.705

GRADE 9

Group	1	2	3
Mean	178.8	179.0	177.7
Standard deviation	3.423	3.443	4.261

* In months as of May 31, 1980

B) Socio-Economic Status

As indicated previously, 63% of all parents of students retained for analysis in this study returned a questionnaire. The

parent questionnaire was designed to allow each to be matched with the individual student's file. The analysis of parents' questionnaires is restricted to parents whose children were retained for this study.

Five questions sought information on variables usually used in creating a socio-economic status index: the occupations of both parents, their respective levels of education and family income. The father's and mother's occupations were rank ordered. The scale used and the correlations between these variables are presented in Appendix 6.

Using the factor score coefficients of the factor analysis of these data, multiplied by the score of each respective variable, a socio-economic status index was created for each student. When one or two variables were missing, the index was calculated by using the mean from the remaining variables. When information on three or more variables was missing, the index attributed to the student file was the average index of the completed files in the class in which the student was enrolled.

C) Covariates and Achievement Results

1) The target population

Before differences between groups of students are analysed, some information on the student population is provided in the correlation analysis presented in Tables 6, 7 and 8.

At the three grade levels, the correlations are high between the English and Mathematics tests results. At the grades 3 and 6 levels, the correlations between the achievement results on

TABLE 6

CORRELATION MATRIX OF COVARIATES AND ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS - IMMERSION STUDENTS - GRADE 3

Variables	CTBS Vocab.	CTBS Reading	CTBS Maths Prob.	CTBS Maths Concep.	Cloze Test	Writing Skills	Test de Franç. Vocab.	Test de Franç. Ortho.	Test de Franç. Gramm.	Test de Franç. Lecture	Aural Compre-hension	Oral Produc.	Intel. Quot.	Socio-economic Status
C.T.B.S. Vocab.	1.000 *****	0.742 0.000	0.601 0.000	0.599 0.000	0.555 0.000	0.430 0.000	0.588 0.000	0.548 0.000	0.531 0.000	0.543 0.000	0.227 0.000	0.109 0.130	0.252 0.000	0.216 0.003
C.T.B.S. Reading	0.742 0.000	1.000 *****	0.651 0.000	0.619 0.000	0.623 0.000	0.514 0.000	0.631 0.000	0.623 0.000	0.577 0.000	0.621 0.000	0.265 0.000	0.212 0.013	0.369 0.000	0.253 0.001
C.T.B.S. Maths Problems	0.601 0.000	0.651 0.000	1.000 *****	0.725 0.000	0.509 0.000	0.441 0.000	0.496 0.000	0.549 0.000	0.540 0.000	0.443 0.000	0.223 0.000	0.096 0.161	0.431 0.000	0.268 0.000
C.T.B.S. Maths Concepts	0.599 0.000	0.619 0.000	0.725 0.000	1.000 *****	0.454 0.000	0.418 0.000	0.411 0.000	0.476 0.000	0.499 0.000	0.376 0.000	0.247 0.000	0.035 0.359	0.417 0.000	0.297 0.000
Cloze Test	0.555 0.000	0.623 0.000	0.509 0.000	0.454 0.000	1.000 *****	0.649 0.000	0.723 0.000	0.744 0.000	0.714 0.000	0.644 0.000	0.435 0.000	0.353 0.000	0.325 0.000	0.109 0.085
Writing Skills	0.430 0.000	0.514 0.000	0.441 0.000	0.418 0.000	0.649 0.000	1.000 *****	0.639 0.000	0.571 0.000	0.619 0.000	0.479 0.000	0.396 0.000	0.247 0.005	0.293 0.000	0.131 0.051
T. de F. Vocab.	0.588 0.000	0.631 0.000	0.496 0.000	0.411 0.000	0.723 0.000	0.639 0.000	1.000 *****	0.729 0.000	0.762 0.000	0.715 0.000	0.431 0.000	0.450 0.000	0.328 0.000	0.149 0.032
T. de F. Ortho.	0.548 0.000	0.623 0.000	0.549 0.000	0.476 0.000	0.744 0.000	0.571 0.000	0.729 0.000	1.000 *****	0.756 0.000	0.692 0.000	0.373 0.000	0.280 0.002	0.310 0.000	0.172 0.015
T. de F. Gramm.	0.531 0.000	0.577 0.000	0.540 0.000	0.499 0.000	0.714 0.000	0.619 0.000	0.762 0.000	0.756 0.000	1.000 *****	0.749 0.000	0.455 0.000	0.370 0.000	0.344 0.000	0.186 0.010
T. de F. Lecture	0.543 0.000	0.621 0.000	0.443 0.000	0.376 0.000	0.644 0.000	0.479 0.000	0.715 0.000	0.692 0.000	0.749 0.000	1.000 *****	0.357 0.000	0.280 0.002	0.262 0.000	0.216 0.003
Aural Compreh.	0.227 0.000	0.265 0.000	0.223 0.000	0.247 0.000	0.435 0.000	0.396 0.000	0.431 0.000	0.373 0.000	0.455 0.000	0.357 0.000	1.000 *****	0.364 0.000	0.221 0.000	0.058 0.235
Oral Product.	0.109 0.130	0.212 0.013	0.096 0.161	0.035 0.359	0.353 0.000	0.247 0.005	0.450 0.000	0.280 0.002	0.370 0.000	0.280 0.002	0.364 0.000	1.000 *****	0.117 0.114	-0.302 0.005
Intellig. Quotient	0.252 0.000	0.369 0.000	0.431 0.000	0.417 0.000	0.325 0.000	0.293 0.000	0.328 0.000	0.310 0.000	0.344 0.000	0.262 0.000	0.221 0.000	0.117 0.114	1.000 *****	0.052 0.258
Socio-economic Status	0.216 0.003	0.253 0.001	0.268 0.000	0.297 0.000	0.109 0.085	0.131 0.051	0.149 0.032	0.172 0.015	0.186 0.010	0.216 0.003	0.058 0.235	-0.302 0.005	0.052 0.258	1.000 *****

TABLE 7

CORRELATION MATRIX OF COVARIATES AND ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS - IMMERSION STUDENTS - GRADE 6

Variables	CTBS Vocab.	CTBS Reading	CTBS Maths Probl.	CTBS Maths Concep.	Cloze Test	Writing Skills	Test de Franç. Vocab.	Test de Franç. Ortho.	Test de Franç. Gramm.	Test de Franç. Lecture	Aural Compre-hension	Oral Prod.	Intel. Quot.	Socio-economic Status
C.T.B.S. Vocab.	1.000 *****	0.800 0.000	0.522 0.000	0.741 0.000	0.574 0.000	0.452 0.000	0.596 0.000	0.413 0.000	0.363 0.000	0.592 0.000	0.463 0.000	0.281 0.004	0.523 0.000	0.493 0.000
C.T.B.S. Reading	0.800 0.000	1.000 *****	0.586 0.000	0.702 0.000	0.637 0.000	0.557 0.000	0.747 0.000	0.588 0.000	0.529 0.000	0.746 0.000	0.547 0.000	0.198 0.035	0.586 0.000	0.403 0.001
C.T.B.S. Maths Problems	0.522 0.000	0.586 0.000	1.000 *****	0.758 0.000	0.424 0.000	0.337 0.000	0.449 0.000	0.377 0.000	0.416 0.000	0.554 0.000	0.326 0.000	0.133 0.111	0.549 0.000	0.177 0.081
C.T.B.S. Maths Concepts	0.741 0.000	0.702 0.000	0.758 0.000	1.000 *****	0.516 0.000	0.445 0.000	0.568 0.000	0.525 0.000	0.468 0.000	0.597 0.000	0.386 0.000	0.145 0.092	0.550 0.000	0.347 0.003
Cloze Test	0.574 0.000	0.637 0.000	0.424 0.000	0.516 0.000	1.000 *****	0.691 0.000	0.732 0.000	0.729 0.000	0.686 0.000	0.717 0.000	0.467 0.000	0.323 0.002	0.504 0.000	0.333 0.004
Writing Skills	0.452 0.000	0.557 0.000	0.337 0.000	0.445 0.000	0.691 0.000	1.000 *****	0.638 0.000	0.644 0.000	0.658 0.000	0.666 0.000	0.315 0.001	0.266 0.008	0.392 0.000	0.152 0.120
T. de F. Vocab.	0.596 0.000	0.747 0.000	0.449 0.000	0.568 0.000	0.732 0.000	0.638 0.000	1.000 *****	0.732 0.000	0.655 0.000	0.821 0.000	0.696 0.000	0.304 0.003	0.561 0.000	0.234 0.036
T. de F. Ortho.	0.413 0.000	0.588 0.000	0.377 0.000	0.525 0.000	0.729 0.000	0.644 0.000	0.732 0.000	1.000 *****	0.739 0.000	0.772 0.000	0.479 0.000	0.256 0.011	0.416 0.000	0.198 0.067
T. de F. Gramm.	0.363 0.000	0.529 0.000	0.416 0.000	0.468 0.000	0.686 0.000	0.658 0.000	0.655 0.000	0.739 0.000	1.000 *****	0.713 0.000	0.394 0.000	0.307 0.002	0.496 0.000	0.115 0.185
T. de F. Lecture	0.592 0.000	0.746 0.000	0.554 0.000	0.597 0.000	0.717 0.000	0.666 0.000	0.821 0.000	0.772 0.000	0.713 0.000	1.000 *****	0.636 0.000	0.312 0.002	0.523 0.000	0.182 0.077
Aural Compreh.	0.463 0.000	0.547 0.000	0.326 0.000	0.386 0.000	0.467 0.000	0.315 0.001	0.696 0.000	0.479 0.000	0.394 0.000	0.636 0.000	1.000 *****	0.178 0.056	0.355 0.000	0.265 0.021
Oral Product.	0.281 0.004	0.198 0.035	0.133 0.111	0.145 0.092	0.323 0.002	0.266 0.008	0.304 0.003	0.256 0.011	0.307 0.002	0.312 0.002	0.178 0.056	1.000 *****	0.275 0.007	-0.031 0.420
Intellig. Quotient	0.523 0.000	0.586 0.000	0.549 0.000	0.550 0.000	0.504 0.000	0.392 0.000	0.561 0.000	0.416 0.000	0.496 0.000	0.523 0.000	0.355 0.000	0.275 0.007	1.000 *****	0.159 0.110
Socio-economic Status	0.493 0.000	0.403 0.001	0.177 0.081	0.347 0.003	0.333 0.004	0.152 0.120	0.234 0.036	0.198 0.067	0.115 0.185	0.182 0.077	0.265 0.021	-0.031 0.420	0.159 0.110	1.000 *****

TABLE 8

CORRELATION MATRIX OF COVARIATES AND ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS - IMMERSION STUDENTS - GRADE 9

Variables	Stanford Math	Stanford Reading	Cloze Test	Writing Skills	Test de Français Vocab.	Test de Français Ortho.	Test de Français Gramm.	Test de Français Lecture	Aural Compre-hension	Oral Product.	Intellig Quotient	Socio-economic Status
Stanford Math	1.000 *****	0.645 0.000	0.231 0.015	0.295 0.002	0.300 0.002	0.148 0.081	0.187 0.037	0.337 0.000	0.061 0.286	-0.293 0.003	0.441 0.000	0.033 0.412
Stanford Reading	0.645 0.000	1.000 *****	0.350 0.000	0.170 0.054	0.359 0.000	0.187 0.037	0.154 0.071	0.437 0.000	0.146 0.086	-0.254 0.008	0.558 0.000	0.066 0.328
Cloze Test	0.231 0.015	0.350 0.000	1.000 *****	0.431 0.000	0.589 0.000	0.439 0.000	0.496 0.000	0.538 0.000	0.090 0.209	0.242 0.014	0.245 0.012	0.115 0.223
Writing Skills	0.295 0.002	0.170 0.054	0.431 0.000	1.000 *****	0.514 0.000	0.297 0.003	0.382 0.000	0.504 0.000	0.304 0.002	0.146 0.094	0.118 0.140	-0.076 0.312
T. de F. Vocab.	0.300 0.002	0.359 0.000	0.589 0.000	0.514 0.000	1.000 *****	0.541 0.000	0.679 0.000	0.648 0.000	0.478 0.000	0.253 0.010	0.231 0.017	0.207 0.097
T. de F. Ortho.	0.148 0.081	0.187 0.037	0.439 0.000	0.297 0.003	0.541 0.000	1.000 *****	0.567 0.000	0.462 0.000	0.310 0.002	0.207 0.029	0.133 0.111	0.236 0.065
T. de F. Gramm.	0.187 0.037	0.154 0.071	0.496 0.000	0.382 0.000	0.679 0.000	0.567 0.000	1.000 *****	0.650 0.000	0.301 0.003	0.309 0.002	0.151 0.083	0.174 0.133
T. de F. Lecture	0.337 0.000	0.437 0.000	0.538 0.000	0.504 0.000	0.648 0.000	0.462 0.000	0.650 0.000	1.000 *****	0.391 0.000	0.247 0.011	0.301 0.002	0.206 0.087
Aural Compreh.	0.061 0.286	0.146 0.086	0.090 0.209	0.304 0.002	0.478 0.000	0.310 0.002	0.301 0.003	0.391 0.000	1.000 *****	0.412 0.000	0.174 0.058	0.113 0.230
Oral Product.	-0.293 0.003	-0.254 0.008	0.242 0.014	0.146 0.094	0.253 0.010	0.207 0.029	0.309 0.002	0.247 0.011	0.412 0.000	1.000 *****	-0.155 0.081	-0.156 0.157
Intellig. Quotient	0.441 0.000	0.558 0.000	0.245 0.012	0.118 0.140	0.231 0.017	0.133 0.111	0.151 0.083	0.301 0.002	0.174 0.058	-0.155 0.081	1.000 *****	0.118 0.218
Socio-economic Status	0.033 0.412	0.066 0.328	0.115 0.223	-0.076 0.312	0.207 0.097	0.236 0.066	0.174 0.133	0.206 0.087	0.113 0.230	-0.156 0.157	0.118 0.218	1.000 *****

the English subtests of the C.T.B.S. and the results on the Cloze test, the Writing Skills test and the four subtests of the Test de Français du Manitoba, range between approximately .40 and .75 and are significant at the .000 level. At the grade 9 level, only the Vocabulary and the Silent Reading subtests of the Test de Français du Manitoba correlate significantly ($p < .000$) with the English Reading results. However, these correlations are low (.36 and .44 respectively).

As previously noted by Swain et al (1976) and Lapkin and Swain (1977), the Cloze test results correlate highly with the French achievement tests. The Oral Production test results do not correlate highly with any achievement results or the covariates.

2) French Comparative Group

The correlation matrices of the French comparative group results on French achievement and proficiency tests are presented in Tables 9, 10 and 11.

The Cloze test correlates highly with the results on the four subtests of the Test de Français du Manitoba for the French comparative group but not as well as for the immersion students. For both groups of students, the correlations between the oral production test and all other tests are low. This is due primarily to the fact that there is very little variation in the scores of this test: most of the students received the maximum score.

TABLE 9

CORRELATION MATRIX OF RESULTS ON FRENCH PROFICIENCY TESTS

FRENCH COMPARATIVE GROUP - GRADE 3

Variables	Cloze Test	Writing Skills	Test de Français Vocab.	Test de Français Ortho.	Test de Français Gramm.	Test de Français Lecture	Aural Comprehension	Oral Product.
Cloze Test	1.0000 *****	0.3072 0.000	0.4716 0.000	0.5658 0.000	0.6001 0.000	0.4073 0.000	0.3183 0.000	0.3221 0.002
Writing Skills	0.3072 0.000	1.0000 *****	0.3074 0.001	0.4335 0.000	0.3560 0.000	0.2708 0.002	0.1951 0.021	0.3093 0.003
T. de F. Vocab.	0.4716 0.000	0.3074 0.001	1.0000 *****	0.6670 0.000	0.7224 0.000	0.6454 0.000	0.4955 0.000	0.4085 0.000
T. de F. Ortho.	0.5658 0.000	0.4335 0.000	0.6670 0.000	1.0000 *****	0.7941 0.000	0.5447 0.000	0.3304 0.000	0.2683 0.008
T. de F. Gramm.	0.6001 0.000	0.3560 0.000	0.7224 0.000	0.7941 0.000	1.0000 *****	0.6341 0.000	0.4438 0.000	0.2054 0.032
T. de F. Lecture	0.4073 0.000	0.2708 0.002	0.6454 0.000	0.5447 0.000	0.6341 0.000	1.0000 *****	0.4467 0.000	0.3260 0.001
Aural Compreh.	0.3183 0.000	0.1951 0.021	0.4955 0.000	0.3304 0.000	0.4438 0.000	0.4467 0.000	1.0000 *****	0.3930 0.000
Oral Product.	0.3221 0.002	0.3093 0.003	0.4085 0.000	0.2683 0.008	0.2054 0.032	0.3260 0.001	0.3930 0.000	1.0000 *****

TABLE 10

CORRELATION MATRIX OF RESULTS ON FRENCH PROFICIENCY TESTS

FRENCH COMPARATIVE GROUP - GRADE 6

Variables	Cloze Test	Writing Skills	Test de Français Vocab.	Test de Français Ortho.	Test de Français Gramm.	Test de Français Lecture	Aural Comprehension	Oral Product.
Cloze Test	1.0000 *****	0.5550 0.000	0.6488 0.000	0.5177 0.000	0.4791 0.000	0.6229 0.000	0.5489 0.000	0.1181 0.158
Writing Skills	0.5550 0.000	1.0000 *****	0.5446 0.000	0.6739 0.000	0.6082 0.000	0.6448 0.000	0.4175 0.000	-0.0140 0.453
T. de F. Vocab.	0.6488 0.000	0.5446 0.000	1.0000 *****	0.6830 0.000	0.7003 0.000	0.8072 0.000	0.6351 0.000	0.1449 0.117
T. de F. Ortho.	0.5177 0.000	0.6739 0.000	0.6830 0.000	1.0000 *****	0.7682 0.000	0.7279 0.000	0.5050 0.000	0.0788 0.263
T. de F. Gramm.	0.4791 0.000	0.6082 0.000	0.7003 0.000	0.7682 0.000	1.0000 *****	0.7700 0.000	0.3986 0.000	-0.0466 0.352
T. de F. Lecture	0.6229 0.000	0.6448 0.000	0.8072 0.000	0.7279 0.000	0.7700 0.000	1.0000 *****	0.6105 0.000	0.0752 0.269
Aural Compreh.	0.5489 0.000	0.4175 0.000	0.6351 0.000	0.5050 0.000	0.3986 0.000	0.6105 0.000	1.0000 *****	0.1111 0.175
Oral Product.	0.1181 0.158	-0.0140 0.453	0.1449 0.117	0.0788 0.263	-0.0466 0.352	0.0752 0.269	0.1111 0.175	1.0000 *****

TABLE 11

CORRELATION MATRIX OF RESULTS ON FRENCH PROFICIENCY TESTS

FRENCH COMPARATIVE GROUP - GRADE 9

Variables	Cloze Test	Writing Skills	Test de Français Vocab.	Test de Français Ortho.	Test de Français Gramm.	Test de Français Lecture	Aural Comprehension	Oral Product.
Cloze Test	1.0000 *****	0.6297 0.000	0.4613 0.000	0.6307 0.000	0.6003 0.000	0.5846 0.000	0.2900 0.000	0.2450 0.023
Writing Skills	0.6297 0.000	1.0000 *****	0.4001 0.000	0.5312 0.000	0.5934 0.000	0.5503 0.000	0.3645 0.001	0.2135 0.046
T. de F. Vocab.	0.4613 0.000	0.4001 0.000	1.0000 *****	0.6703 0.000	0.5776 0.000	0.6936 0.000	0.5081 0.000	0.3851 0.001
T. de F. Ortho.	0.6307 0.000	0.5312 0.000	0.6703 0.000	1.0000 *****	0.8159 0.000	0.7123 0.000	0.2829 0.009	0.2846 0.009
T. de F. Gramm.	0.6003 0.000	0.5934 0.000	0.5776 0.000	0.8159 0.000	1.0000 *****	0.7432 0.000	0.2333 0.027	0.2543 0.019
T. de F. Lecture	0.5846 0.000	0.5503 0.000	0.6936 0.000	0.7123 0.000	0.7432 0.000	1.0000 *****	0.4995 0.000	0.2948 0.008
Aural Compreh.	0.2900 0.008	0.3645 0.001	0.5081 0.000	0.2829 0.009	0.2333 0.027	0.4995 0.000	1.0000 *****	0.1578 0.105
Oral Product.	0.2450 0.023	0.2135 0.046	0.3851 0.001	0.2846 0.009	0.2543 0.019	0.2948 0.008	0.1578 0.105	1.0000 *****

D) Achievement in English and Mathematics

1) Grade 3

The analyses of covariance on achievement results in English and Mathematics for the grade 3 immersion students are presented in Table 12. The covariates are the intelligence quotient and the socio-economic status. There are significant differences among groups in three subtests. There are no significant differences among groups in the Maths Problems subtest.

Tables 12A to 12C present tests of differences among means using the Scheffe test and correcting for differences between the "n's" in each cell.

TABLE 12

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE OF ENGLISH AND MATHEMATICS ACHIEVEMENT*

IMMERSION STUDENTS - GRADE 3

Group \ Achievement		C.T.B.S. Vocabulary Percentiles	C.T.B.S. Reading Percentiles	C.T.B.S. Maths Problems	C.T.B.S. Maths Concepts
1	N = 56	62.20	63.56	58.09	44.45
		(62.30)	(63.93)	(58.64)	(44.75)
2	N = 61	58.18	56.75	62.14	50.15
		(58.52)	(57.17)	(62.82)	(50.80)
3	N = 79	66.33	69.62	64.07	57.46
		(66.96)	(70.14)	(64.96)	(58.54)
4	N = 18	68.67	68.87	58.47	51.71
		(72.29)	(72.18)	(64.12)	(58.06)
5	N = 17	55.52	50.58	65.08	51.69
		(50.71)	(45.36)	(56.36)	(42.93)
6	N = 14	39.54	40.15	52.96	42.74
		(34.79)	(35.50)	(45.07)	(34.29)
Significance of F		0.000	0.000	0.104	0.001

* The means in parentheses are the unadjusted means; the numbers above these are the means adjusted for I.Q. and S.E.S.

TABLE 12A

TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS

C.T.B.S. - VOCABULARY - GRADE 3

Group	Mean	1 N=56	2 N=61	3 N=79	4 N=18	5 N=17	6 N=14
1	62.20		.882	.893	.915	1.090	2.736**
2	58.18			1.750	1.479	.432	2.245*
3	66.33				.328	1.743	3.214**
4	68.67					1.606	2.941**
5	55.52						1.726
6	39.54						

* = $p < .05$ - ** = $p < .01$ - *** = $p < .001$

TABLE 12B

TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS

C.T.B.S. - READING - GRADE 3

Group	Mean	1 N=56	2 N=61	3 N=79	4 N=18	5 N=17	6 N=14
1	63.56		1.538	1.417	.735	1.957	2.753**
2	56.75			2.849**	1.645	.909	1.924
3	69.62				.103	2.845**	3.446***
4	68.87					2.062*	2.776**
5	50.58						1.049
6	40.15						

* = $p < .05$ - ** = $p < .01$ - *** = $p < .001$

TABLE 12C

TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS

C.T.B.S. - MATHS CONCEPTS - GRADE 3

Group	Mean	1 N=56	2 N=61	3 N=79	4 N=18	5 N=17	6 N=14
1	44.45		1.221	2.823**	1.031	1.002	.230
2	50.15			1.573	.221	.212	.991
3	57.46				.819	.800	1.979
4	51.71					.002	.981
5	51.69						.964
6	42.74						

* = $p < .05$ - ** = $p < .01$ - *** = $p < .001$

Table 12A presents the test of differences among means, correcting for unequal cells, on the English Vocabulary subtest. The total immersion group in the Français school setting scored significantly lower than the four total immersion programmes in either an Immersion or an English setting. There is no significant difference between the mean of the partial immersion group and the other groups.

The same pattern is observed for the English Reading percentiles. However, the tests of differences among means in Table 12B indicate additional differences. The total immersion group in the Français school scored significantly lower than the other total immersion groups except the total immersion group which started English Language Arts in grade 2.

The partial immersion group scored somewhat less well than the total immersion group which started the English Language Arts programme in grade 1 and the total immersion group in the English setting. There is, however, no significant difference between the partial immersion programme group and the total immersion group which took English Language Arts in grade 2 or the total immersion group which started both readings in grade 1 (group 1).

Finally, there is a significant difference ($p < .01$) between the total immersion programme students who had English Language Arts in grade 2 in an Immersion school (group 2) and the total immersion students in the Immersion setting who had English Language Arts in grade 1 (group 3).

In Maths Concepts, Table 12C indicates that there is one significant difference; however, no overall pattern is evident.

Table 12D presents the results of the tests of differences among means of the Canadian Test of Basic Skills. Each group mean

TABLE 12D

TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS, CANADIAN NORMS, BY GROUP - GRADE 3

Group \ Test		English Vocabulary	English Reading	Maths Problems	Maths Concepts
1	N = 56	3.846***	4.712***	2.284*	1.604
2	N = 61	2.524*	2.034*	3.864***	.241
3	N = 79	3.338*	5.877***	4.233***	1.965
4	N = 20	3.662**	3.351**	2.523*	1.658
5	N = 18	.698	.406	1.854	.809
6	N = 14	1.991	1.818	.615	2.348*

* $p<.05$ - ** $p<.01$ - *** $p<.001$

is compared to the national norm mean. The means are unadjusted scores. In English Vocabulary, Maths Problems and English Reading, all total immersion groups except the total immersion group in a Français school obtained significantly higher results than the Canadian norm mean. The latter group (6) and the partial immersion group (5) did not obtain scores significantly different from the national norm mean.

On the Maths Concepts test, all groups except the total immersion in a Français school (group 6) obtained results not significantly different from the national norm mean. The latter group (6) obtained significantly lower results ($p < .05$).

2) Grade 6

The analyses of covariance on achievement in English Vocabulary and Reading, and the Mathematics Problems and Concepts subtests of the Canadian Test of Basic Skills, are presented in Table 13. The covariates are the intelligence quotient and the socio-economic status. There are significant differences on the Vocabulary and Reading subtests and on the Maths Problems. There is no significant difference on the Maths Concepts test.

Table 13A indicates no significant difference among groups on the English Vocabulary subtest. Even though the analysis of covariance indicated a significant difference among groups, the test of differences among means, correcting for unequal "n's", does not indicate a significant difference among groups.

However, on the English Reading test, the total immersion groups scored significantly better than the partial immersion group

in an Immersion setting (Table 13B). There are no significant differences between these total immersion groups and the partial immersion group in an English setting.

Table 13C indicates one difference ($p < .05$) between groups in Maths Problems. The partial immersion group in the English setting obtained a significantly lower score than the other groups.

TABLE 13

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE OF ENGLISH AND MATHEMATICS ACHIEVEMENT*

GRADE 6

Group \ Achievement		C.T.B.S. Vocabulary Percentiles	C.T.B.S. Reading Percentiles	C.T.B.S. Maths Problems	C.T.B.S. Maths Concepts
1	N = 38	49.28 (56.03)	57.09 (65.14)	58.15 (66.46)	59.94 (67.16)
2	N = 39	60.22 (57.09)	64.06 (60.90)	61.91 (57.31)	69.53 (65.82)
3	N = 18	47.37 (38.82)	45.71 (37.80)	69.17 (61.18)	69.62 (61.53)
4	N = 12	66.41 (67.00)	52.99 (52.80)	38.82 (37.80)	56.43 (56.20)
Significance of F		0.015	0.000	0.008	0.474

* The means in the parentheses are the unadjusted means; the numbers above these are the means adjusted for I.Q. and S.E.S.

TABLE 13A

TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS - C.T.B.S. - VOCABULARY - GRADE 6

Group	Mean	1 N=38	2 N=39	3 N=18	4 N=12
1	49.28		1.713	.236	1.739
2	60.22			1.517	.609
3	47.37				1.683
4	66.41				

TABLE 13B

TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS - C.T.B.S. - READING - GRADE 6

Group	Mean	1 N=38	2 N=39	3 N=18	4 N=12
1	57.09		1.267	1.685	.409
2	64.06			2.587*	1.081
3	45.71				.664
4	52.99				

TABLE 13C

TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS - C.T.B.S. - MATHS PROBLEMS

GRADE 6

Group	Mean	1 N=38	2 N=39	3 N=18	4 N=12
1	58.15		.656	1.245	2.046*
2	61.91			.809	2.415*
3	69.17				2.594*
4	38.82				

* $p < .05$

Table 13D presents the tests of differences among means. The unadjusted group means are compared to the national norm mean.

In English Vocabulary, the partial immersion group in an English setting obtained a significantly higher mean score than the national norm mean ($p<.05$). The other groups did not obtain scores significantly different from the national norm mean.

In the English Reading, Maths Problems and Maths Concepts tests, the total immersion groups (1 and 2) obtained significantly higher mean scores than the national norm ($p<.001$ and $p<.05$ respectively). The partial immersion groups (3 and 4) did not obtain results significantly different from the national norm mean ($p>.05$).

TABLE 13D

TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS, CANADIAN NORMS, BY GROUP

GRADE 6

Group / Test		English Vocabulary	English Reading	Maths Problems	Maths Concepts
1	N = 38	1.678	4.482***	4.380***	5.593***
2	N = 39	1.190	2.423*	2.069*	3.615**
3	N = 18	1.482	2.113	1.358	1.617
4	N = 12	2.277*	.636	.814	1.197

* $p<.05$ - ** $p<.01$ - *** $p<.001$

3) Grade 9

At the grade 9 level, two tests were administered. The first deals with English language skills and the second with mathematics. Mean scores for each group are expressed in percentiles in Table 14. The analysis of covariance indicates significant differences between groups in both the English and mathematics scores. The covariates used are the intelligence quotient and the socio-economic status.

Even though the analysis of covariance was significant for English, the test of differences among means is not significant when correcting for unequal cells (Table 14A).

TABLE 14

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE OF ENGLISH AND MATHEMATICS ACHIEVEMENT*

GRADE 9

Group \ Achievement		Stanford English Percentiles	Stanford Mathematics Percentiles
1	N= 14	74.11 (73.64)	70.35 (69.71)
2	N= 14	59.46 (55.23)	50.46 (47.83)
3	N= 69	74.05 (75.02)	67.22 (67.88)
Significance of F		0.001	0.007

* The means in parentheses are the unadjusted means; the numbers above these are the means adjusted for I.Q. and S.E.S.

TABLE 14A

TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS - ENGLISH

GRADE 9

Group	Mean	1 N=14	2 N=14	3 N=69
1	74.11		1.469	.010
2	59.46			1.717
3	74.05			

Table 14B presents the test of differences among means for the Mathematics results at the grade 9 level. Although group 2 (early total immersion now in partial immersion) had average scores, it scored significantly lower than the two other groups. Groups 1 and 3 did not obtain significantly different results ($p>.05$).

TABLE 14B

TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS - MATHEMATICS

GRADE 9

Group	Mean	1 N=14	2 N=14	3 N=69
1	70.35		2.658*	.552
2	50.46			2.928**
3	67.22			

* $p<.05$ - ** $p<.01$

Table 14C presents the results of the tests of differences among means. The unadjusted group means are compared to the national norm mean.

On the English test, groups 1 and 3 obtained significantly higher mean scores than the Canadian norm mean ($p < .01$ and $p < .001$ respectively). Group 2 (early immersion now in partial immersion) did not obtain scores significantly different from the national norm mean ($p > .05$).

On the mathematics test, groups 1 and 3 obtained significantly higher scores than the Canadian norm mean ($p < .001$) whereas group 2 did not ($p > .05$).

TABLE 14C

TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS, CANADIAN NORMS, BY GROUP - GRADE 9

Group / Test		English	Mathematics
1	N = 14	4.308**	4.491***
2	N = 14	0.740	0.0
3	N = 69	11.819***	9.154***

** $p < .01$ - *** $p < .001$

E) French Language Skills

The French language skills at the three levels were measured by the four subtests of the Test de Français du Manitoba, the Cloze test and the Aural Comprehension test. Since all the analyses were performed on the raw scores of these tests, it is important to indicate the number of items at each grade level.

Table 15 shows the total number of items per test and by grade level.

Two other measures of French language skills were used. They are the Writing Skills test and the Oral Production test (see chapter IV for a description). The French immersion groups are compared to the French comparative group on all measures.

TABLE 15

NUMBER OF ITEMS IN FRENCH TESTS, BY GRADE

Test \ Grade	3	6	9
Test de Français - vocabulaire	70	69	68
- orthographe, ponctuation et majuscules	64	81	78
- grammaire	45	75	84
- lecture silencieuse	43	62	59
Cloze Test	15	25	31
Aural Comprehension Test	26	22	23

1) Grade 3

The results of the analyses of covariance of the achievement results on the Test de Français du Manitoba are presented in Table 16. The covariates are the intelligence quotient and the socio-economic status for the French immersion students. There are significant differences for the four subtests.

TABLE 16

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE OF ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS ON

THE TEST DE FRANÇAIS DU MANITOBA - GRADE 3

Group \ Test de Français		Vocabulaire	Orthographe Ponctuation et Majuscules	Grammaire	Lecture silencieuse
1	N = 54	32.38 (32.74)	30.12 (30.43)	20.68 (20.86)	17.33 (17.31)
2	N = 52	31.03 (32.35)	34.62 (34.67)	26.22 (26.40)	18.60 (18.65)
3	N = 74	33.39 (33.59)	32.40 (32.27)	22.73 (22.69)	17.68 (17.84)
4	N = 20	24.64 (26.05)	28.40 (29.16)	17.90 (18.74)	14.37 (15.16)
5	N = 18	19.34 (17.44)	22.36 (20.94)	13.40 (12.28)	12.66 (12.00)
6	N = 12	17.10 (15.33)	20.36 (18.64)	14.58 (13.00)	13.59 (12.27)
French comparative group	N = 109	43.12	36.82	29.65	21.57
Significance of F		0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

Table 16A presents the tests of differences among means for the Vocabulary subtest of the Test de Français du Manitoba. The French comparative group obtained significantly higher results than all the French immersion groups. The total immersion groups in an Immersion setting (groups 1, 2 and 3) did not obtain significantly different results among themselves. However, they had superior results when compared to either the early total immersion programme group in an English setting, the partial immersion group or the

early total immersion group in a Français school. There is no significant difference between the partial immersion programme results on the Vocabulary test and the early total immersion programme group in a Français school. The early total immersion programme group in an English setting scored significantly higher than group 6.

Table 16B presents the tests of differences among means on the test "orthographe, ponctuation et majuscules".

The French comparative group did significantly better than the early total immersion programme groups 1, 3, 4, the partial immersion programme group and the early total immersion group in a Français school.

The early total immersion group 2 obtained significantly higher scores than the early immersion groups 1 and 4 ($p<.05$). The three early total immersion groups in an Immersion setting (groups 1, 2 and 3) obtained significantly higher results than the partial immersion group and the early total immersion group in a Français school.

The early immersion group 4 obtained a significantly higher result than group 6 ($p<.05$).

For the "test de grammaire", similar findings are reported as for the "test de vocabulaire" (Table 16C). The French comparative group had significantly higher scores than all immersion groups.

TABLE 16A

TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS - TEST DE FRANÇAIS

VOCABULAIRE - GRADE 3

Group	Mean	1 N=54	2 N=52	3 N=74	4 N=20	5 N=18	6 N=12	French comparative group N=109
1	32.38		.617	.433	2.885**	5.259***	5.690***	4.824***
2	31.03			1.150	2.616**	5.271***	5.695***	6.263***
3	33.39				3.403**	5.958***	6.329***	4.655***
4	24.64					1.958	2.603**	7.462***
5	19.34						.827	10.546***
6	17.10							10.494***
French comparative group	43.12							

TABLE 16B

TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS - TEST DE FRANÇAIS

ORTHOGRAPHE, PONCTUATION ET MAJUSCULES - GRADE 3

Group	Mean	1 N=54	2 N=52	3 N=74	4 N=20	5 N=18	6 N=12	French comparative group N=109
1	30.12		2.324*	1.128	.621	3.257**	3.766***	3.561***
2	34.62			1.201	2.352*	5.479***	5.800***	1.299
3	32.40				1.477	4.343***	4.766***	2.469*
4	28.40					2.022	2.547*	3.233**
5	22.36						.708	6.603***
6	20.36							6.814***
French comparative group	36.82							

* = $p < .05$ - ** = $p < .01$ - *** = $p < .001$

TABLE 16C

TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS - TEST DE FRANÇAIS - GRAMMAIRE - GRADE 3

Group	Mean	1 N=54	2 N=52	3 N=74	4 N=20	5 N=18	6 N=12	French comparative group N=109
1	20.68		4.371***	1.597	1.700	5.299***	3.834***	7.735***
2	26.22			2.709**	5.075***	9.302***	7.298***	2.945**
3	22.73				2.924**	6.697***	5.069***	5.852***
4	17.90					2.612**	1.747	7.544***
5	13.40						.702	12.698***
6	14.58							9.976***
French comparative group	29.65							

* = $p < .05$ - ** = $p < .01$ - *** = $p < .001$

The total immersion groups in an Immersion setting obtained significantly higher scores than the partial immersion group and the early total immersion group in a Français school. The early total immersion group, in which the introduction of English Language Arts was delayed until grade 2, obtained better results on French Grammar then did the other total immersion groups.

On the Reading test of the Test de Français du Manitoba (lecture silencieuse), the French comparative group obtained significantly higher scores than did the immersion groups (Table 16D).

The early immersion groups in an Immersion setting did not score differently one from the other. However, only these three groups (1, 2 and 3) scored significantly better than the early total immersion group in an English setting, the partial immersion group and the total immersion group in a Français school.

TABLE 16D

TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS, TEST DE FRANÇAIS, LECTURE SILENCIEUSE - GRADE 3

Group	Mean	1 N=54	2 N=52	3 N=74	4 N=20	5 N=18	6 N=12	French comparative group N=109
1	17.33		1.210	.350	2.219*	3.485**	2.331*	4.551***
2	18.60			.883	3.099**	4.332***	3.072**	3.043**
3	17.68				2.494*	3.763***	2.557*	4.215***
4	14.37					1.069	.427	5.640***
5	12.66						.508	6.943***
6	13.59							5.124***
French comparative group	21.57							

* $p < .05$ - ** $p < .01$ - *** $p < .001$

The analyses of covariance on the Cloze and Aural Comprehension tests are presented in Table 17. There are significant differences among means which are analysed in Table 17A for the Cloze test and 17B for the Aural Comprehension test. The covariates are the intelligence quotient and the socio-economic status for the French immersion students.

The French comparative group obtained significantly higher scores on the Cloze test than did the immersion groups. The partial immersion programme group scored significantly lower than all total immersion groups (except the one in a Français school). Furthermore, only the total immersion groups in the Immersion setting obtained slightly higher scores than the total immersion group in the Français school. Two early total immersion groups (2 and 3) scored significantly higher than the early total immersion group in an English setting (group 4).

TABLE 17

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE OF THE RESULTS OF

THE CLOZE AND AURAL COMPREHENSION TESTS - GRADE 3

Group \ Test	Cloze test	Aural comprehension
1	6.50 (6.55) N= 56	20.63 (20.73) N= 51
2	6.95 (7.00) N= 60	22.07 (22.11) N= 57
3	6.79 (6.82) N= 74	21.31 (21.31) N= 70
4	5.44 (5.63) N= 19	19.98 (20.16) N= 19
5	3.55 (3.13) N= 16	17.35 (17.00) N= 18
6	4.46 (4.07) N= 14	20.67 (20.27) N= 11
French comparative group	7.75 N= 114	23.58 N= 106
Significance of F	0.000	0.000

TABLE 17A

TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS - CLOZE TEST - GRADE 3

Group	Mean	1 N=56	2 N=60	3 N=74	4 N=19	5 N=16	6 N=14	French comparative group N=114
1	6.50		1.034	.632	1.779	4.656***	2.165*	3.037**
2	6.95			.362	2.591*	5.473***	2.666*	2.039*
3	6.79				2.247*	5.078***	2.465*	2.294*
4	5.44					2.545**	.962	4.087***
5	3.55						.874	6.944***
6	4.46							3.564***
French comparative group	7.75							

* $p<.05$ - ** $p<.01$ - *** $p<.001$

TABLE 17B

TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS - AURAL COMPREHENSION - GRADE 3

Group	Mean	1 N=51	2 N=57	3 N=70	4 N=19	5 N=18	6 N=11	French comparative group N=106
1	20.63		2.619**	1.061	.977	4.254***	.031	5.553***
2	22.07			1.446	3.769***	6.962***	1.149	3.934***
3	21.31				2.062*	5.253***	.507	4.487***
4	19.98					3.396***	.541	6.716***
5	17.35						2.491*	9.398***
6	20.67							2.404*
French comparative group	23.58							

* $p<.05$ - ** $p<.01$ - *** $p<.001$

Table 17B indicates that the French comparative group obtained significantly higher scores than did all the immersion groups on the Aural Comprehension test. The total immersion programme students had significantly higher scores than the partial immersion group.

The analyses of covariance on the four scales of the Writing test and the average total score are presented in Table 18 and are significant at the .000 level. With a few exceptions, the common pattern in the five tables (18A to 18E) of tests of differences among means can be summed up as follows. The French comparative group obtained significantly higher results than the partial immersion group and the total immersion group in the Français school. The other total immersion programmes obtained results similar to those of the French comparative group. Secondly, the three total

immersion programme groups in an Immersion setting obtained significantly higher results on the Writing test than did the partial immersion programme group or the early total immersion group in a Français school.

The Oral Production test is the last measure of French proficiency. A detailed analysis of five measures and the average total are presented in Table 19. The measures were taken from a random sample of each group or from the total group if the numbers were too small.

There is no significant difference among the groups on the Comprehension measure. The students generally understood everything that the interviewer said. There are significant differences on the

TABLE 18

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE OF THE WRITING SKILLS TEST - GRADE 3

Writing Skill / Group	Spelling	Grammar	Vocabulary	Communication	Average total
1 N = 56	2.68 (2.69)	2.67 (2.68)	2.83 (2.85)	2.72 (2.73)	2.75 (2.74)
2 N = 58	2.83 (2.84)	2.79 (2.79)	2.91 (2.94)	2.87 (2.88)	2.87 (2.86)
3 N = 75	2.48 (2.49)	2.59 (2.59)	2.72 (2.73)	2.87 (2.88)	2.68 (2.67)
4 N = 20	2.40 (2.47)	2.39 (2.45)	2.56 (2.65)	2.49 (2.57)	2.61 (2.54)
5 N = 19	2.07 (1.97)	1.98 (1.89)	2.02 (1.92)	2.14 (2.03)	1.85 (1.95)
6 N = 14	1.83 (1.71)	1.74 (1.64)	2.13 (2.00)	2.07 (1.93)	1.70 (1.82)
French comparative group N = 114	3.00	2.88	3.13	2.92	2.98
Significance of F	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

TABLE 18A

TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS - WRITING SKILLS

SPELLING - GRADE 3

Group	Mean	1 N=56	2 N=58	3 N=75	4 N=20	5 N=19	6 N=14	French comparative group N=114
1	2.68		1.244	1.361	1.081	2.727**	2.555**	2.510**
2	2.83			2.727**	1.727	3.586***	3.078**	1.610
3	2.48				.305	1.799	1.937	3.856***
4	2.40					1.057	1.434	2.378*
5	2.07						.639	4.307***
6	1.83							3.573***
French comparative group	3.00							

TABLE 18B

TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS - WRITING SKILLS

GRAMMAR - GRADE 3

Group	Mean	1 N=56	2 N=58	3 N=75	4 N=20	5 N=19	6 N=14	French comparative group N=114
1	2.67		1.087	.594	1.249	3.123**	3.240**	1.799
2	2.79			1.569	1.818	3.739***	3.701***	.831
3	2.59				.858	2.652**	2.891**	2.180*
4	2.39					1.406	1.888	2.195*
5	1.98						.701	4.093***
6	1.74							3.983***
French comparative group	2.88							

* $p<.05$ - ** $p<.01$ - *** $p<.001$

TABLE 18C

TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS - WRITING SKILLS

VOCABULARY - GRADE 3

Group	Mean	1 N=56	2 N=58	3 N=75	4 N=20	5 N=19	6 N=14	French comparative group N=114
1	2.83		.586	.701	1.099	3.524**	2.056*	2.172*
2	2.91			1.336	1.480	4.044***	2.336*	1.816
3	2.72				.643	3.001**	1.721	2.853**
4	2.56					1.799	1.099	2.401*
5	2.02						.288	5.021***
6	2.13							2.989***
French comparative group	3.13							

TABLE 18D

TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS - WRITING SKILLS

COMMUNICATION - GRADE 3

Group	Mean	1 N=56	2 N=58	3 N=75	4 N=20	5 N=19	6 N=14	French comparative group N=114
1	2.72		1.063	.988	.938	2.811**	1.927	1.493
2	2.87			0.000	1.544	3.520**	2.367*	.369
3	2.87				1.506	3.398**	2.335*	.341
4	2.49					1.213	1.069	1.776*
5	2.14						.189	3.849***
6	2.07							2.537*
French comparative group	2.92							

* $p<.05$ - ** $p<.01$ - *** $p<.001$

TABLE 18E

TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS - WRITING SKILLS - AVERAGE TOTAL - GRADE 3

Group	Mean	1 N=56	2 N=58	3 N=75	4 N=20	5 N=19	6 N=14	French comparative group N=114
1	2.75		1.066	.513	.618	4.348***	3.334**	1.954
2	2.87			1.517	1.182	5.105***	3.771***	1.052
3	2.68				.300	3.876***	3.066**	2.311*
4	2.61					2.711*	2.478*	1.662
5	1.85						.422	5.574***
6	1.70							4.101***
French comparative group	2.98							

TABLE 19

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE OF ORAL PRODUCTION MEASURES - GRADE 3

Group \ Oral Production		Communi-cation	Pronun-ciation	Grammar	Vocabulary	Communi-cation	Average total
1	N = 21	4.98 (4.98)	4.16 (4.19)	4.17 (4.19)	4.26 (4.29)	4.84 (4.86)	4.49 (4.50)
2	N = 17	5.00 (5.00)	4.11 (4.12)	3.95 (3.97)	4.04 (4.06)	4.85 (4.85)	4.39 (4.40)
3	N = 20	5.00 (5.00)	4.00 (4.00)	3.98 (4.00)	4.54 (4.57)	5.00 (5.00)	4.51 (4.51)
4	N = 17	5.00 (5.00)	3.76 (3.74)	3.50 (3.50)	3.69 (3.68)	4.81 (4.79)	4.16 (4.14)
5	N = 18	5.00 (5.00)	3.82 (3.81)	3.65 (3.61)	3.54 (3.50)	4.63 (4.64)	4.14 (4.11)
6	N = 9	5.00 (5.00)	4.46 (4.50)	4.05 (4.06)	4.36 (4.39)	4.97 (5.00)	4.58 (4.59)
French comparative group	N = 82	5.00	4.93	4.79	4.82	4.98	4.90
Significance of F		0.280	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

* See Appendix 2 for scales used in scoring

other measures of oral production, i.e. on Pronunciation, Grammar and Syntax, Vocabulary, Communication and the average total. Table 19A indicates that the pronunciation of the French comparative group is significantly more native-like than that of all the immersion groups. However, it should be noted that the difference is minimal between this group and the total immersion group in a Français school. This latter group has a more native-like pronunciation than the partial immersion or the total immersion groups in an English setting and one total immersion group in an Immersion setting. Furthermore, the total immersion groups in the Immersion setting have a more native-like pronunciation than the groups in the English setting.

The same observations are made for the knowledge of grammar and syntax (Table 19B) and the vocabulary used (Table 19C).

There are few differences among groups on the scale measuring willingness to communicate in French (Table 19D, Oral Production - Communication).

The French comparative group and the total immersion programme group in a Français school demonstrate better communication than does the partial immersion group.

Table 19E indicates that, although the Oral Production of the French comparative group is significantly better than that of the immersion groups, the type of setting does influence the oral production of the immersion groups. Those in an Immersion setting

TABLE 19A

TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS - ORAL PRODUCTION

PRONUNCIATION - GRADE 3

Group	Mean	1 N=21	2 N=17	3 N=20	4 N=17	5 N=18	6 N=9	French comparative group N=82
1	4.16		.375	1.506	2.388*	2.530*	1.518	7.065***
2	4.11			1.366	2.295*	2.519*	1.891	9.753***
3	4.00				1.853	2.188*	2.760*	8.454***
4	3.76					.391	3.316**	8.880***
5	3.82						3.443**	12.946***
6	4.46							2.791**
French comparative group	4.93							

TABLE 19B

TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS - ORAL PRODUCTION

GRAMMAR - GRADE 3

Group	Mean	1 N=21	2 N=17	3 N=20	4 N=17	5 N=18	6 N=9	French comparative group N=82
1	4.17		1.216	1.278	3.991***	2.725*	.528	4.144***
2	3.95			.261	3.241**	1.808	.484	7.232***
3	3.98				5.151***	2.537*	.390	15.060***
4	3.50					.990	2.813*	13.634***
5	3.65						1.856	8.696***
6	4.05							4.109***
French comparative group	4.79							

* $p<.05$ - ** $p<.01$ - *** $p<.001$

TABLE 19C

TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS - ORAL PRODUCTION

VOCABULARY - GRADE 3

Group	Mean	1 N=21	2 N=17	3 N=20	4 N=17	5 N=18	6 N=9	French comparative group N=82
1	4.26		1.023	1.442	2.701*	3.782***	.459	3.253*
2	4.04			3.000**	1.880	3.081**	1.652	5.553***
3	4.54				5.266***	7.508***	1.059	2.653*
4	3.69					.956	3.542**	8.421***
5	3.54						4.947***	13.000***
6	4.36							3.184**
French comparative group	4.82							

TABLE 19D

TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS - ORAL PRODUCTION

COMMUNICATION - GRADE 3

Group	Mean	1 N=21	2 N=17	3 N=20	4 N=17	5 N=18	6 N=9	French comparative group N=82
1	4.84		.088	2.042*	.241	1.466	1.659	1.767
2	4.85			1.503	.310	1.507	1.442	1.547
3	5.00				1.968	3.084**	----	1.677
4	4.81					1.169	1.658	1.748
5	4.63						2.834*	2.903**
6	4.97							.838
French comparative group	4.98							

* $p<.05$ - ** $p<.01$ - *** $p<.001$

TABLE 19E

TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS - ORAL PRODUCTION

AVERAGE TOTAL - GRADE 3

Group	Mean	1 N=21	2 N=17	3 N=20	4 N=17	5 N=18	6 N=9	French comparative group N=82
1	4.49		.898	.219	2.929**	3.100**	.730	4.534***
2	4.39			1.691	2.373*	2.572*	1.743	7.305***
3	4.51				4.792***	5.039***	.791	13.636***
4	4.16					.203	3.805**	10.288***
5	4.14						3.977***	10.511***
6	4.58							3.655**
French comparative group	4.90							

* $p<.05$ - ** $p<.01$ - *** $p<.001$

or in a Français school score significantly higher than the groups in an English setting. The programme seems to play a less important role than the setting.

2) Grade 6

The analyses of covariance on the raw scores of the Test de Français du Manitoba are presented in Table 20. For the French immersion groups, the covariates are the intelligence quotient and the socio-economic status. There are significant differences on the four subtests. Groups 3 and 4 are partial immersion programmes, the first in an Immersion setting, the second in an English setting. Groups 1 and 2 are total immersion programmes in Immersion settings. However, for group 1, reading in French was introduced in grade 1 and English Language Arts in grade 2, while the opposite is true for group 2.

The tests of differences among means, using corrective procedures for unequal cells, indicate that there is no difference between the French comparative group and the total immersion group 2 in Vocabulary (Table 20A). The partial immersion programme groups score significantly lower than the French comparative group and the early total immersion groups.

On the Orthographe, Ponctuation et Majuscules test, the French comparative group and the total immersion groups (1 and 2) did not obtain scores significantly different from one another (Table 20B). However, these groups obtained significantly higher results than the partial immersion groups (3 and 4).

TABLE 20

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE OF THE RESULTS

OF THE TEST DE FRANÇAIS DU MANITOBA* - GRADE 6

Group \ Test de Français		Vocabulaire	Orthographe Ponctuation et Majuscules	Grammaire	Lecture silencieuse
1	N = 34	35.53 (38.50)	43.18 (45.44)	49.46 (52.18)	32.75 (35.47)
2	N = 33	39.05 (37.76)	43.90 (42.97)	46.35 (45.18)	33.37 (32.18)
3	N = 18	27.61 (25.11)	35.26 (33.06)	36.24 (33.89)	25.42 (23.17)
4	N = 11	26.51 (26.91)	28.90 (29.45)	32.86 (33.27)	22.94 (23.27)
French comparative group	N = 82	40.87	45.26	52.21	33.83
Significance of F		0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

* The means in parentheses are unadjusted; the scores above these are the means adjusted for I.Q. and S.E.S.

Table 20C presents the tests of differences among means for the subtest of Grammaire. The pattern previously observed is evident with one difference. The total immersion group in the Immersion setting, in which reading in French was introduced in grade

TABLE 20A

TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS - TEST DE FRANÇAIS

VOCABULAIRE - GRADE 6

Group	Mean	1 N=34	2 N=33	3 N=18	4 N=11	French comparative group N=82
1	35.53		1.478	3.153**	2.336*	2.850**
2	39.05			4.048***	3.080**	.799
3	27.61				.265	5.493***
4	26.51					3.781***
French comparative group	40.87					

TABLE 20B

TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS - TEST DE FRANÇAIS

ORTHOGRAPHE, PONCTUATION ET MAJUSCULES - GRADE 6

Group	Mean	1 N=34	2 N=33	3 N=18	4 N=11	French comparative group N=82
1	43.18		.249	2.417*	4.190***	.879
2	43.90			2.841*	4.254***	.537
3	35.26				1.652	3.369**
4	28.90					5.256***
French comparative group	45.26					

* $p<.05$ - ** $p<.01$ - *** $p<.001$

TABLE 20C

TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS - TEST DE FRANÇAIS

GRAMMAIRE - GRADE 6

Group	Mean	1 N=34	2 N=33	3 N=18	4 N=11	French comparative group N=82
1	49.46		1.211	4.474***	4.530***	1.502
2	46.35			2.942**	3.320**	2.311*
3	36.24				.783	5.456***
4	32.86					5.312***
French comparative group	52.21					

TABLE 20D

TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS - TEST DE FRANÇAIS

LECTURE SILENCIEUSE - GRADE 6

Group	Mean	1 N=34	2 N=33	3 N=18	4 N=11	French comparative group N=82
1	32.75		.303	2.983**	3.160**	.648
2	33.37			2.924**	3.146**	.226
3	25.42				.692	3.437**
4	22.94					3.517**
French comparative group	33.83					

* $p<.05$ - ** $p<.01$ - *** $p<.001$

2, scored significantly lower than the French comparative group.

On the test of Lecture silencieuse, the pattern observed for the test of Orthographe, Ponctuation et Majuscules is reproduced (Table 20D).

The analyses of covariance of the raw score results of the Cloze and Aural Comprehension tests are presented in Table 21.

Table 21A presents the tests of differences among means for the Cloze test. The French comparative group obtained significantly higher scores than did three of the immersion groups; only the total immersion group in an Immersion setting, which was introduced to reading in French at the grade 1 level, obtained a score equal to that of the French comparative group. This latter immersion group also scored significantly better than the three other immersion groups. The total immersion group, which was introduced to reading in French in grade 2, obtained significantly higher scores than the partial immersion groups.

On the Aural Comprehension test, the French comparative group and the total immersion group 2 did not obtain results significantly different from one another (Table 21B). However, the French comparative group and the total immersion groups obtained significantly higher scores than the partial immersion programme groups. Although the partial immersion programmes are offered in different settings, there is no significant difference among them.

The analyses of covariance of the results of each scale and the average total of the Writing Skills test are presented in Table 22. Significant differences at the .05 level appear for all measures and the average total.

TABLE 21

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE OF THE RESULTS ON

THE CLOZE AND AURAL COMPREHENSION TESTS* - GRADE 6

Group \ Test	Cloze test	Aural Comprehension
1	9.85 (10.46) N= 37	10.67 (11.26) N= 34
2	8.46 (8.18) N= 38	12.06 (11.82) N= 33
3	5.53 (4.88) N= 17	8.61 (8.06) N= 18
4	5.27 (5.30) N= 10	8.32 (8.45) N= 11
French comparative group	10.59 N= 92	12.82 N= 82
Significance of F	0.000	0.000

* The means in parentheses are unadjusted; the scores above these are the means adjusted for I.Q. and S.E.S.

TABLE 21A

TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS - CLOZE TEST - GRADE 6

Group	Mean	1 N=37	2 N=38	3 N=17	4 N=10	French comparative group N=92
1	9.85		2.124*	4.454***	4.513***	1.284
2	8.46			2.997**	3.121**	3.613***
3	5.53				.208	5.456***
4	5.27					5.462***
French comparative group	10.59					

* = $p<.05$ - ** = $p<.01$ - *** = $p<.001$

TABLE 21B

TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS

AURAL COMPREHENSION - GRADE 6

Group	Mean	1 N=34	2 N=33	3 N=18	4 N=11	French comparative group N=82
1	10.67		1.602	2.814**	2.568*	3.108**
2	12.06			4.444***	3.962***	1.042
3	8.61				.353	7.504***
4	8.32					5.732***
French comparative group	12.82					

* = $p < .05$ - ** = $p < .01$ - *** = $p < .001$

TABLE 22

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE OF THE RESULTS ON THE WRITING SKILLS TEST*

GRADE 6

Group \ Writing Skills		Spelling	Grammar	Vocabulary	Communication	Average total
1	N = 36	3.48 (3.56)	2.95 (3.03)	3.37 (3.47)	3.34 (3.47)	3.32 (3.38)
2	N = 38	3.28 (3.25)	2.84 (2.79)	3.33 (3.28)	3.36 (3.29)	3.20 (3.15)
3	N = 16	3.03 (2.94)	2.83 (2.72)	2.89 (2.78)	2.99 (2.88)	2.85 (2.83)
4	N = 12	2.88 (2.92)	2.30 (2.33)	2.48 (2.50)	2.76 (2.79)	2.60 (2.64)
French comparative group	N = 92	3.21	2.91	3.24	3.17	3.13
Significance of F		0.027	0.010	0.001	0.020	0.003

* See Appendix 2 for the definition of each scale and the scoring procedure

The means in parentheses are unadjusted, the scores above these are adjusted for I.Q. and S.E.S.

Tables 22A to 22E present the tests of differences among means of the groups for all measures. The general pattern that is apparent in these analyses can be summed up as follows: there are no differences between the French comparative group and the two total immersion groups or the partial immersion group in an Immersion setting. There are no differences between the partial immersion groups: however, the partial immersion group in an English setting obtained significantly lower scores on the Writing Skills measures than the other groups.

The analyses of covariance of the results of the Oral Production test are presented in Table 23. There are no significant differences on the Comprehension scale and on the Communication scale (willingness to communicate).

TABLE 22A

TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS - WRITING SKILLS

SPELLING - GRADE 6

Group	Mean	1 N=36	2 N=38	3 N=16	4 N=12	French comparative group N=92
1	3.48		1.361	2.006	2.335*	1.948
2	3.28			1.119	3.529**	.511
3	3.03				.803	.826
4	2.88					4.114***
French comparative group	3.21					

* $p<.05$ - ** $p<.01$ - *** $p<.001$

TABLE 22B

TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS - WRITING SKILLS

GRAMMAR - GRADE 6

Group	Mean	1 N=36	2 N=38	3 N=16	4 N=12	French comparative group N=92
1	2.95		.872	.773	4.201***	.350
2	2.84			.063	3.427**	.593
3	2.83				2.917**	.538
4	2.30					4.117***
French comparative group	2.91					

TABLE 22C

TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS - WRITING SKILLS

VOCABULARY - GRADE 6

Group	Mean	1 N=36	2 N=38	3 N=16	4 N=12	French comparative group N=92
1	3.37		.280	1.873	4.690***	.981
2	3.33			1.699	4.394***	.654
3	2.89				1.426	1.381
4	2.48					4.089***
French comparative group	3.24					

* $p<.05$ - ** $p<.01$ - *** $p<.001$

TABLE 22D

TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS - WRITING SKILLS

COMMUNICATION - GRADE 6

Group	Mean	1 N=36	2 N=38	3 N=16	4 N=12	French comparative group N=92
1	3.34		.149	1.413	2.699*	1.244
2	3.36			1.526	2.879**	1.498
3	2.99				.780	.738
4	2.76					1.949
French comparative group	3.17					

TABLE 22E

TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS - WRITING SKILLS

AVERAGE TOTAL - GRADE 6

Group	Mean	1 N=36	2 N=38	3 N=16	4 N=12	French comparative group N=92
1	3.32		1.063	2.299*	5.251***	1.667
2	3.20			1.731	4.487***	.637
3	2.85				1.154	1.381
4	2.60					3.936***
French comparative group	3.13					

* $p < .05$ - ** $p < .01$ - *** $p < .001$

TABLE 23

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE OF THE RESULTS OF THE ORAL PRODUCTION TEST*

GRADE 6

Group \ Oral Production		Comprehension	Pronunciation	Grammar	Vocabulary	Communication	Average total
1	N = 23	4.91	3.96	4.01	4.42	4.87	4.44
		(5.00)	(4.04)	(4.11)	(4.59)	(4.96)	(4.54)
2	N = 26	4.86	3.95	4.01	4.40	4.80	4.40
		(4.81)	(3.91)	(3.93)	(4.28)	(4.74)	(4.35)
3	N = 14	4.71	3.48	3.36	3.58	4.50	3.93
		(4.64)	(3.43)	(3.29)	(3.46)	(4.43)	(3.85)
4	N = 12	4.99	4.24	4.16	4.10	4.82	4.44
		(5.00)	(4.25)	(4.17)	(4.13)	(4.83)	(4.47)
French comparative group	N = 73	4.93	4.91	4.88	4.86	4.89	4.89
Significance of F		0.538	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.184	0.000

* See Appendix 2 for the details of the scales and the scoring procedure

The means in parentheses are unadjusted; the scores above these are the means adjusted for I.Q. and S.E.S.

The results of the tests of differences among means indicate that the major differences are found between the French comparative group and the French immersion groups, the latter obtaining significantly lower results (see Tables 23A to 23D). Some significant differences are observed among immersion groups; the partial immersion groups obtain significantly lower scores than the total immersion groups.

TABLE 23A

TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS - ORAL PRODUCTION

PRONUNCIATION - GRADE 6

Group	Mean	1 N=23	2 N=26	3 N=14	4 N=12	French comparative group N=73
1	3.96		.062	1.622	2.204	8.619***
2	3.95			1.429	1.514	5.311***
3	3.48				2.428*	4.664***
4	4.24					4.462***
French comparative group	4.91					

TABLE 23B

TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS - ORAL PRODUCTION

GRAMMAR - GRADE 6

Group	Mean	1 N=23	2 N=26	3 N=14	4 N=12	French comparative group N=73
1	4.01		.000	2.259*	.897	7.588***
2	4.01			1.995	.662	4.554***
3	3.36				2.494*	5.120***
4	4.16					3.948***
French comparative group	4.88					

* $p<.05$ - ** $p<.01$ - *** $p<.001$

TABLE 23C

TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS - ORAL PRODUCTION

VOCABULARY - GRADE 6

Group	Mean	1 N=23	2 N=26	3 N=14	4 N=12	French comparative group N=73
1	4.42		.093	2.594*	1.511	3.156**
2	4.40			2.268*	1.128	2.162*
3	3.58				1.447	3.973***
4	4.10					3.634**
French comparative group	4.86					

TABLE 23D

TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS - ORAL PRODUCTION

AVERAGE TOTAL - GRADE 6

Group	Mean	1 N=23	2 N=26	3 N=14	4 N=12	French comparative group N=73
1	4.44		.234	1.647	.000	4.527***
2	4.40			1.339	.211	2.543*
3	3.93				1.593	2.978*
4	4.44					3.499**
French comparative group	4.89					

* $p<.05$ - ** $p<.01$ - *** $p<.001$

3) Grade 9

The analyses of covariance of the results on the Test de Français du Manitoba are presented in Table 24. There are significant differences among groups on the four subtests. For the French immersion group, the covariates are the intelligence quotient and the socio-economic status.

The tests of differences among means presented in Tables 24A to 24D indicate that significant differences occur between the French comparative group and the immersion groups, the first obtaining significantly higher scores. There is, however, no significant difference between group 2 and the French comparative group on the

TABLE 24

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE OF THE RESULTS ON THE TEST DE FRANÇAIS DU MANITOBA*

GRADE 9

Test de Français / Group		Vocabulaire	Orthographe Ponctuation et Majuscules	Grammaire	Lecture silencieuse
1	N = 10	25.63 (25.09)	31.91 (31.56)	32.97 (32.67)	29.42 (29.00)
2	N = 13	30.80 (30.36)	40.02 (40.14)	45.08 (45.21)	27.26 (27.21)
3	N = 58	29.54 (29.67)	31.69 (31.80)	35.12 (35.21)	24.71 (24.88)
French comparative group	N = 67	45.82	43.56	56.96	35.62
Significance of F		0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

* The means in parentheses are unadjusted; the scores above these are adjusted for I.Q. and S.E.S.

subtest of Orthographe, Ponctuation et Majuscules. On this test, group 2 obtain significantly higher results than group 3. On the Grammaire test, group 2 obtained significantly higher results than groups 1 and 3. There are no significant differences among French immersion groups on the Lecture Silencieuse test.

TABLE 24A

TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS - TEST DE FRANÇAIS - VOCABULAIRE - GRADE 9

Group	Mean	1 N=10	2 N=13	3 N=58	French comparative group N=67
1	25.63		1.187	1.132	5.738***
2	30.80			.410	4.776***
3	29.54				9.656***
French comparative group	45.82				

TABLE 24B

TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS - TEST DE FRANÇAIS

ORTHOGRAPHE, PONCTUATION ET MAJUSCULES - GRADE 9

Group	Mean	1 N=10	2 N=13	3 N=58	French comparative group N=67
1	31.91		1.967	.082	4.002***
2	40.02			2.360*	.958
3	31.69				5.992***
French comparative group	43.60				

* $p<.05$ - ** $p<.01$ - *** $p<.001$

TABLE 24C

TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS - TEST DE FRANÇAIS

GRAMMAIRE - GRADE 9

Group	Mean	1 N=10	2 N=13	3 N=58	French comparative group N=67
1	32.97		3.078**	.786	8.223***
2	45.08			2.748*	3.156***
3	35.12				8.794***
French comparative group	56.36				

TABLE 24D

TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS - TEST DE FRANÇAIS

LECTURE SILENCIEUSE - GRADE 9

Group	Mean	1 N=10	2 N=13	3 N=58	French comparative group N=67
1	29.42		.583	1.931	2.525*
2	27.26			.799	2.611*
3	24.71				6.904***
French comparative group	35.54				

* $p<.05$ - ** $p<.01$ - *** $p<.001$

Table 25 presents the analyses of covariance of the results on the Cloze and Aural Comprehension tests. Significant differences are observed for both tests.

The tests of differences among means on the Cloze test indicate that the French comparative group obtained significantly

higher scores than the immersion groups (Table 25A). The early total immersion group now in partial immersion (group 2) scored significantly higher than the early partial immersion group.

TABLE 25

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE OF THE RESUSLTS ON THE CLOZE AND AURAL COMPREHENSION TESTS* - GRADE 9

Group \ Test	Cloze test	Aural Comprehension
1	11.39	13.31
	(11.27) N= 12	(13.22) N= 11
2	13.86	14.10
	(13.50) N= 14	(14.07) N= 13
3	12.35	10.38
	(12.41) N= 65	(10.41) N= 59
French comparative group	16.19 N= 75	17.32 N= 65
Significance of F	0.000	0.000

* The means in parentheses are unadjusted; the scores above these are the means adjusted for I.Q. and S.E.S.

TABLE 25A

TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS - CLOZE TEST - GRADE 9

Group	Mean	1 N=12	2 N=14	3 N=65	French comparative group N=75
1	11.39		2.142*	.946	4.935***
2	13.86			1.627	2.645*
3	12.35				5.555***
French comparative group	16.21				

* $p<.05$ - ** $p<.01$ - *** $p<.001$

Table 25B presents the tests of differences among means for the Aural Comprehension test. Although the French comparative group obtained significantly higher results than the immersion groups, the total early immersion group (2) and the early partial group (3) obtained higher results than the late partial immersion group.

TABLE 25B

TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS - AURAL COMPREHENSION - GRADE 9

Group	Mean	1 N=11	2 N=13	3 N=59	French comparative group N=65
1	13.31		.503	2.347*	3.163**
2	14.10			3.316**	2.815**
3	10.38				10.946***
French comparative group	17.54				

* $p<.05$ - ** $p<.01$ - *** $p<.001$

Table 26 presents the analyses of covariance of the individual scales and the average total results of the Writing Skills test. Significant differences are observed on all scales and the average total.

The results of the tests of differences among means presented in Tables 26A to 26E can be summed up as follows. Generally, the French comparative group demonstrates significantly better writing skills than the immersion groups. Within immersion groups, comparisons indicate that the early partial immersion group obtained slightly better results than the early total and late partial immersion groups. The latter groups obtained similar results on all scales.

TABLE 26

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE OF WRITING SKILLS TEST RESULTS* - GRADE 9

Writing Skills / Group	Spelling	Grammar	Vocabulary	Communication	Average total
1 N = 12	3.38	2.88	2.73	3.05	3.01
	(3.38)	(2.88)	(2.75)	(3.04)	(3.01)
2 N = 13	2.60	2.17	2.60	2.82	2.55
	(2.58)	(2.15)	(2.54)	(2.77)	(2.51)
3 N = 67	2.85	2.14	2.27	2.68	2.49
	(2.86)	(2.14)	(2.28)	(2.69)	(2.49)
French comparative group N = 72	3.92	3.54	3.65	3.56	3.67
Significance of F	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

* See Appendix 2 for definitions and scales

The means in parentheses are unadjusted; the scores above these are the means adjusted for I.Q. and S.E.S.

TABLE 26A

TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS - WRITING SKILLS - SPELLING - GRADE 9

Group	Mean	1 N=12	2 N=13	3 N=67	French comparative group N=72
1	3.38		3.148**	2.271*	2.327*
2	2.60			1.611	8.613***
3	2.85				8.316***
French comparative group	3.92				

* $p < .05$ - ** $p < .01$ - *** $p < .001$

TABLE 26B

TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS - WRITING SKILLS

GRAMMAR - GRADE 9

Group	Mean	1 N=12	2 N=13	3 N=67	French comparative group N=72
1	2.88		3.041**	3.789***	3.398***
2	2.17			.170	7.830***
3	2.14				11.725***
French comparative group	3.54				

TABLE 26C

TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS - WRITING SKILLS

VOCABULARY - GRADE 9

Group	Mean	1 N=12	2 N=13	3 N=67	French comparative group N=72
1	2.73		.491	2.062*	4.288***
2	2.60			1.643	5.442***
3	2.27				10.625***
French comparative group	3.65				

* $p<.05$ - ** $p<.01$ - *** $p<.001$

TABLE 26D

TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS - WRITING SKILLS

COMMUNICATION - GRADE 9

Group	Mean	1 N=12	2 N=13	3 N=67	French comparative group N=72
1	3.05		1.304	2.515*	3.635**
2	2.82			.858	4.715***
3	2.68				7.141***
French comparative group	3.56				

TABLE 26E

TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS - WRITING SKILLS

AVERAGE TOTAL - GRADE 9

Group	Mean	1 N=12	2 N=13	3 N=67	French comparative group N=72
1	3.01		2.349*	3.023**	3.914***
2	2.55			.406	7.789***
3	2.49				10.811***
French comparative group	3.67				

* $p<.05$ - ** $p<.01$ - *** $p<.001$

The analyses of covariance of the Oral Production test results are presented in Table 27. Significant differences are observed on four measures: Pronunciation, Grammar and Syntax, Vocabulary and the average total. Nc significant differences are observed on Comprehension and Communication.

The tests of differences among means indicate that the French comparative group demonstrated better oral production skills than the immersion groups (Tables 27A to 27D). The early total immersion group obtained significantly higher scores than the late partial immersion group on the four scales and than the early partial immerion group on Vocabulary and the average total ($p < .05$).

TABLE 27

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE OF THE ORAL PRODUCTION TEST RESULTS*

GRADE 9

Group \ Oral Production	Comprehension	Pronunciation	Grammar	Vocabulary	Communication	Average total
1 N = 13	5.00 (5.00)	3.78 (3.81)	3.83 (3.85)	3.86 (3.88)	5.00 (5.00)	4.30 (4.31)
2 N = 13	5.00 (5.00)	4.10 (4.08)	4.08 (4.08)	4.40 (4.38)	5.00 (5.00)	4.52 (4.51)
3 N = 65	4.99 (4.99)	3.71 (3.71)	3.53 (3.53)	3.58 (3.58)	4.91 (4.91)	4.15 (4.15)
French comparative group N = 70	5.00	4.96	4.86	4.76	4.95	4.91
Significance of F	0.693	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.228	0.000

* See Appendix 2 for definitions and scales

The means in parentheses are unadjusted; the scores above these are the means adjusted for I.Q. and S.E.S.

TABLE 27A

TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS - ORAL PRODUCTION

PRONUNCIATION - GRADE 9

Group	Mean	1 N=13	2 N=13	3 N=65	French comparative group N=70
1	3.78		1.756	.404	7.094***
2	4.10			4.192***	10.882***
3	3.71				22.465***
French comparative group	4.96				

TABLE 27B

TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS - ORAL PRODUCTION

GRAMMAR - GRADE 9

Group	Mean	1 N=13	2 N=13	3 N=65	French comparative group N=70
1	3.83		1.381	1.639	5.795***
2	4.08			6.991***	11.943***
3	3.53				18.776***
French comparative group	4.86				

* $p<.05$ - ** $p<.01$ - *** $p<.001$

TABLE 27C

TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS - ORAL PRODUCTION

VOCABULARY - GRADE 9

Group	Mean	1 N=13	2 N=13	3 N=65	French comparative group N=70
1	3.86		2.415*	1.741	5.341***
2	4.40			6.836***	3.414***
3	3.58				15.480***
French comparative group	4.76				

TABLE 27D

TEST OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS - ORAL PRODUCTION

AVERAGE TOTAL - GRADE 9

Group	Mean	1 N=13	2 N=13	3 N=65	French comparative group N=70
1	4.30		2.261*	1.555	6.497***
2	4.52			8.247***	9.981***
3	4.15				20.601***
French comparative group	4.91				

* $p<.05$ - ** $p<.01$ - *** $p<.001$

F) Students' Motivation, Attitudes and Activities

The objective of the student questionnaire was to gather information that would give some insight into the achievement and linguistic results and assist in their interpretation.

The questions in section A of the student questionnaires (see Appendix 3) were created according to a conceptual scheme. Eight groups of questions were produced and are reflected by the indices below. A factor analysis of all the questions in this section reveals that one main factor accounts for most of the variance. We wish to caution the reader regarding the analysis of the indices: even though we could be dealing with one aspect of a main factor, the analysis of the indices can provide some insight into the motivation and attitudes of students.

The indices were created by taking the average response of the student on the questions included in the index. The questions included in each index are presented in Appendix 3.

Index A brings together the questions dealing with parental encouragement of the immersion programme and the learning of French. Table 28 indicates that, at the grade 3 level, there are significant differences among groups. The tests of differences among means indicate that the students in the partial immersion programme in an English setting feel that their parents encourage them less than do those of groups 1, 2 and 6 ($p<.05$). At the grade 6 level (Table 29), there are no significant differences among groups for this index. At the grade 9 level (Table 30), there are no significant differences among groups for all indices.

Questions included in index B refer to the motivational factor of need achievement. This index refers to the student's desire to succeed and to achieve difficult goals. Although the analysis of variance, at the grade 6 level, is significant at the .05 level, the tests of differences among means, correcting for unequal cells, do not indicate any significant differences among groups.

TABLE 28

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF INDICES, BY GROUP - GRADE 3

Index \ Group	N=50 1	N=58 2	N=73 3	N=18 4	N=18 5	N=13 6	Significance
A- Parental encouragement	2.035	2.166	2.238	2.322	2.733	1.831	0.0022
B- Need achievem.	2.483	2.529	2.756	2.852	2.537	2.846	0.3252
C- Anxiety during French class	3.128	3.112	3.131	3.278	2.722	3.199	0.1252
D- Integrative motivation	1.936	1.841	2.089	1.889	2.111	1.942	0.4542
E- Instrumental motivation	2.333	2.685	2.747	2.736	2.764	2.692	0.0806
F- Attitudes	2.058	2.116	2.202	2.306	2.292	1.923	0.4310
G- Anxiety in school situat.	2.353	2.603	2.683	2.708	2.139	2.692	0.0079
H- Attitudes re learning French	1.683	1.466	1.680	1.789	1.689	1.600	0.2750

Maximum = 1.0 - Minimum = 5.0

TABLE 29

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF INDICES, BY GROUP - GRADE 6

Index \ Group	N=36 1	N=39 2	N=17 3	N=12 4	Significance
A- Parental encouragement	2.260	2.328	2.494	2.583	0.2910
B- Need achievem.	2.628	2.415	2.812	2.550	0.0429
C- Anxiety during French class	3.139	3.115	3.073	3.083	0.9787
D- Integrative motivation	2.095	2.020	2.454	2.298	0.0378
E- Instrumental motivation	2.266	2.192	2.328	2.250	0.8631
F- Attitudes	2.157	2.129	2.516	2.466	0.0330
G- Anxiety in school situat.	2.333	2.812	1.941	2.521	0.0001
H- Attitudes re learning French	1.833	1.624	2.265	1.717	0.0007

TABLE 30

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF INDICES, BY GROUP - GRADE 9

Index \ Group	N=13 1	N=13 2	N=66 3	Significance
A- Parental encouragement	2.500	2.369	2.692	0.2371
B- Need achievem.	2.567	2.723	3.002	0.3786
C- Anxiety during French class	2.875	3.288	2.910	0.1556
D- Integrative motivation	2.738	2.549	2.749	0.6330
E- Instrumental motivation	2.333	2.165	2.459	0.1665
F- Attitudes	3.074	2.658	2.721	0.5182
G- Anxiety in school situat.	1.917	2.135	2.076	0.8225
H- Attitudes re learning French	2.133	1.939	2.078	0.7357

Analysis of the anxiety felt by students during French classes indicates that there is very little difference among groups and across grade levels (Index C). This index refers to the students' feelings regarding their use of French in the classroom. Students seem to be very much at ease in this situation even though the students in partial immersion programmes demonstrate more anxiety.

Index D refers to integrative motivation, that is the desire to meet more French people, participate in French cultural activities and generally to understand French Canadians. For grade 6 students, the analysis of variance is significant at the .05 level. However, the tests of differences among means correcting for unequal cells do not indicate significant differences among groups. One observation can be made across grades. The integrative motivation index suggests that this factor is strongest at the grade 3 level, and weakest at the grade 9 level. It seems to be related to both the type of programme (total or partial) and the type of setting (Immersion or English). The level of integrative motivation tends to be greatest in the total immersion programme in an Immersion setting.

Index E refers to instrumental motivation for learning a second language, that is the learning of French for self use or advancement. There are no significant differences among groups within grade levels and no overall patterns across grades.

Index F refers to questions dealing with attitudes towards French Canadians. Although there are no differences within grade

levels, attitudes are more positive in grade 3, while at the grade 9 level, students seem to be neutral. Studying the grade 6 and 9 results on this scale, the type of programme and setting seems to exert some influence: the total immersion programme in an Immersion setting fosters more positive attitudes.

The anxiety in the school situation is evaluated by index G. This index refers to feelings regarding the learning of French, in the school or in the general environment. An analysis across grades indicates that students feel more anxiety about the use of French in an English setting than do students in an Immersion setting.

As indicated by Index H, attitudes towards learning French are positive at all grade levels.

Tables 31, 32 and 33 present the students' perception of their use of French by groups for grades 3, 6 and 9 respectively. Several observations within and across grades are made. Students at all levels, and progressively from grade 3 to grade 9, hardly ever use French outside the school situation (i.e. French television, radio, newspapers and magazines, records). Students in English settings use French less often within the school or the classroom than do students in Immersion settings. This observation is compounded by the type of programme. Students in a partial immersion programme in an English setting use French less often than do students in a total immersion programme in an English setting.

TABLE 31

STUDENTS' PERCEPTION OF THEIR USE OF FRENCH, BY GROUP - GRADE 3

Question \ Group	1 N=51	2 N=58	3 N=73	4 N=18	5 N=18	6 N=13
Watch French television?	3.46	3.36	3.36	3.33	3.56	3.62
Listen to French radio?	3.95	4.26	4.08	4.67	4.33	4.39
Speak French to classmates in classroom?	2.18	1.76	1.84	1.72	2.12	1.46
Speak French to classmates outside the classroom?	2.92	3.35	3.00	3.33	4.28	4.08
Speak French to classmates outside the school?	4.32	4.02	4.06	3.94	4.35	4.46
Speak French to other students in school?	3.15	2.69	2.29	3.44	3.71	3.08
Speak French to French teacher in the classroom?	1.26	1.09	1.29	1.28	1.72	1.23
Speak French to French teacher outside the classroom?	1.51	1.16	1.44	2.33	2.44	1.77
Speak French to other teachers in school?	1.69	1.33	1.67	2.28	2.28	1.69
Read French newspapers and magazines outside the classroom?	3.90	3.38	3.96	4.67	4.00	4.67
Speak French outside the school?	3.53	3.29	3.56	3.89	3.72	3.77
Read French-language books that are not textbooks used in class?	2.36	1.97	2.37	3.06	2.39	2.77
Listen to French records outside the classroom?	3.39	3.88	3.19	4.11	3.44	4.08
Parents try to help with French?	2.31	2.02	2.64	2.33	2.28	2.62
Parents encourage you to practise French?	2.51	1.95	2.58	2.78	3.17	2.85

1) Most of the time - 2) Often - 3) Sometimes

4) Hardly ever - 5) Never

TABLE 32

STUDENTS' PERCEPTION OF THEIR USE OF FRENCH, BY GROUP - GRADE 6

Question \ Group	1 N=36	2 N=37	3 N=17	4 N=12
Watch French television?	3.78	3.21	3.71	3.33
Listen to French radio?	4.19	3.65	4.53	4.67
Speak French to classmates in classroom?	2.50	1.58	2.65	2.67
Speak French to classmates outside the classroom?	3.42	3.00	3.71	3.83
Speak French to classmates outside the school?	4.14	3.81	4.31	3.33
Speak French to other students in school?	2.97	2.18	3.47	4.27
Speak French to French teacher in the classroom?	1.11	1.00	1.24	1.25
Speak French to French teacher outside the classroom?	1.22	1.11	1.53	2.67
Speak French to other teachers in school?	1.19	1.03	2.24	2.33
Read French newspapers and magazines outside the classroom?	3.81	3.45	4.35	3.83
Speak French outside the school?	3.61	3.37	4.25	3.00
Read French-language books that are not textbooks used in class?	2.94	2.47	3.41	3.33
Listen to French records outside the classroom?	4.03	3.58	4.29	3.92
Parents try to help with French?	2.64	2.66	2.35	2.00
Parents encourage you to practise French?	2.00	1.58	2.12	1.83

1) Most of the time - 2) Often - 3) Sometimes

4) Hardly ever - 5) Never

TABLE 33

STUDENTS' PERCEPTION OF THEIR USE OF FRENCH, BY GROUP - GRADE 9

Question \ Group	1 N=13	2 N=13	3 N=66
Watch French television?	4.17	4.15	4.08
Listen to French radio?	5.00	4.46	4.64
Speak French to classmates in classroom?	3.17	3.62	3.20
Speak French to classmates outside the classroom?	4.67	4.15	4.09
Speak French to classmates outside the school?	4.83	4.31	4.26
Speak French to other students in school?	4.50	4.46	4.36
Speak French to French teacher in the classroom?	2.00	1.15	1.46
Speak French to French teacher outside the classroom?	4.50	2.00	1.91
Speak French to other teachers in school?	4.33	2.31	3.36
Read French newspapers and magazines outside the classroom?	4.67	4.08	4.20
Speak French outside the school?	3.67	3.31	3.62
Read French-language books that are not textbooks used in class?	4.83	3.85	3.74
Listen to French records outside the classroom?	4.67	4.08	4.49
Parents try to help with French?	3.00	4.15	3.62
Parents encourage you to practise French?	2.33	2.08	2.27

1) Most of the time - 2) Often - 3) Sometimes

4) Hardly ever - 5) Never

Students were asked whether they would continue in the French immersion programme if they had the choice. They were then asked to explain their decision. The reasons given by the students who wanted to continue were counted and the percentages indicate the frequency of response divided by the number of students who indicated their desire to continue.

At the grade 3 level, over 85% of the students in each group stated that they wanted to continue in French immersion (Table 34). The main reasons given were that they liked French, they were interested in learning another language, and that they enjoyed their school situation.

At the grade 6 level, the percentage of students wanting to continue in the French immersion programme is similar to grade 3 (Table 35). However, there is an exception. Approximately one quarter of the students in the partial immersion programme in the Immersion setting said they did not want to continue. For those who indicated they wanted to stay in the French immersion programme, the main reasons at this level are interest in learning another language and anticipated better job opportunities. The main reasons given for not continuing are that they hate French, they hate the teacher or the programme was too difficult.

Table 36 indicates that approximately half of the students at the grade 9 level wanted to continue in the French immersion programme. One-third of the early partial immersion students and one-half of the late partial immersion students indicated that they did not want to continue, while 31% of the early total immersion group said they did not know.

The analysis of the reasons given indicates that the early immersion students like French better than the other groups. all

TABLE 34

STUDENTS' DECISION TO CONTINUE IN THE FRENCH IMMERSION PROGRAMME AND REASONS, BY GROUP - GRADE 3

Group / Decision	1 N=59	2 N=58	3 N=73	4 N=18	5 N=18	6 N=13
Yes - will continue	84.6%	91.4%	84.9%	88.9%	88.9%	92.3%
No - will not continue	5.1%	1.7%	2.7%	5.6%	0.0%	7.7%
Don't know	10.3%	6.9%	12.3%	5.6%	11.1%	0.0%
Reasons to continue	**N=33**	**N=53**	**N=62**	**N=16**	**N=16**	**N=12**
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Better job opportunities	6.1 (2)	9.4 (5)	4.8 (3)	6.3 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Because I like French	24.2 (8)	28.3 (15)	35.5 (22)	37.5 (6)	37.5 (6)	25.0 (3)
Have taken in previous years (why quit now)	0.0 (0)	1.9 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Enjoy learning and/or speaking French	18.2 (6)	15.1 (8)	24.2 (15)	18.8 (3)	12.5 (2)	16.7 (2)
Parents want me to	15.2 (5)	13.2 (7)	14.5 (9)	31.3 (5)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Meeting or to meet French people	9.1 (3)	15.1 (8)	21.0 (13)	12.6 (2)	6.3 (1)	8.3 (1)
Like school or the programme or teachers	12.1 (4)	30.2 (16)	11.3 (7)	6.3 (1)	25.0 (4)	8.3 (1)
Interest in learning another language	36.4 (12)	18.9 (9)	21.0 (13)	12.5 (2)	18.8 (3)	41.7 (5)

The numbers in parentheses indicate the frequency of the response

TABLE 35

STUDENTS' DECISION TO CONTINUE IN THE FRENCH IMMERSION PROGRAMME AND REASONS, BY GROUP - GRADE 6

Group / Decision	1 N=36	2 N=39	3 N=17	4 N=12
Yes - will continue	86.1%	84.6%	70.6%	83.3%
No - will not continue	2.8%	5.1%	23.5%	0.0%
Don't know	11.1%	10.3%	5.9%	16.7%
Reasons to continue	**N=31 %**	**N=33 %**	**N=12 %**	**N=10 %**
Better job opportunities	25.8 (8)	36.4 (12)	25.0 (3)	30.0 (3)
Because I like French	6.5 (2)	21.2 (7)	25.0 (3)	20.0 (2)
Have taken in previous years (why quit now)	12.9 (4)	15.2 (5)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Enjoy learning and/or speaking French	12.9 (4)	15.2 (5)	8.3 (1)	30.0 (3)
Meeting or to meet French people	12.9 (4)	0.0 (0)	8.3 (1)	10.0 (1)
Like school or the programme or teachers	19.4 (6)	3.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	30.0 (3)
Interest in learning another language	32.3 (10)	30.3 (10)	50.0 (6)	20.0 (2)

The numbers in parentheses indicate the frequency of the response

TABLE 36

STUDENTS' DECISION TO CONTINUE IN THE FRENCH IMMERSION PROGRAMME AND REASONS, BY GROUP - GRADE 9

Decision \ Group	1 N=12	2 N=13	3 N=66
Yes - will continue	50.0%	61.5%	45.5%
No - will not continue	33.3%	7.7%	48.5%
Don't know	16.7%	30.8%	6.1%
	N=6	N=8	N=30
Reasons to continue	%	%	%
Better job opportunities	33.3 (2)	50.0 (4)	30.0 (9)
Because I like French	0.0 (0)	37.5 (3)	6.7 (2)
Have taken in previous years (why quit now)	33.3 (2)	62.5 (5)	26.7 (8)
Enjoy learning and/or speaking French	33.3 (2)	25.0 (2)	20.0 (6)
Meeting or to meet French people	33.3 (2)	0.0 (0)	3.3 (1)
Like school or the programme or teachers	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	10.0 (3)
Interest in learning another language	0.0 (0)	25.0 (2)	43.3 (13)

The numbers in parentheses indicate the frequency of the response

students feel that they will have better job opportunities. For the early total group, the feeling that they want to continue the programme because they have taken it in previous years, is much stronger than for the early partial or late partial groups.

Table 36A presents the reasons given by the students who indicated they did not want to continue in the French immersion programme next year. Few reasons were given by the students in groups 1 and 2. However, for group 3, where approximately half the students indicated they did not want to continue, the major reasons given are that they don't like school, they find French boring or that French hurts their marks. One quarter of the students gave one of these reasons. Other reasons given include having to quit for no specified reason, or hating French.

TABLE 36A

REASONS GIVEN BY STUDENTS WHO DO NOT WANT TO CONTINUE IN THE FRENCH IMMERSION PROGRAMME - GRADE 9

Reason \ Group	1 N=6	2 N=1	3 N=32
Don't like school	1	0	9
French is boring	1	1	8
French hurts marks	0	0	8
Have to quit	0	0	5
Hate French	0	0	3
To have more time off	0	0	1
Depends on problems	0	1	1
Options uncertain	0	1	1

Table 37 presents the students' participation in activities held in French by groups and grades. Students in Immersion settings at the grade 3 level participate more in activities held in French than do the groups in English settings or in the Français school. The main activities center around the church, sports, relatives and camp.

TABLE 37

STUDENTS' PARTICIPATION IN ACTIVITIES HELD IN FRENCH

BY GROUP AND BY GRADE

GRADE 3

Participation \ Group	1 N=56	2 N=62	3 N=81	4 N=20	5 N=19	6 N=14
Yes	59.0	55.2	46.6	17.6	11.1	16.7
No	41.0	44.8	53.4	82.4	88.9	83.3

GRADE 6

Participation \ Group	1 N=38	2 N=41	3 N=18	4 N=12
Yes	14.3	18.4	17.6	41.7
No	85.7	81.6	82.4	58.3

GRADE 9

Participation \ Group	1 N=14	2 N=15	3 N=71
Yes	16.7	8.3	9.1
No	83.3	91.7	90.9

At the grade 6 level, one group participates more than the others because of the churches in the students' vicinity. The general conclusion at the grades 6 and 9 levels is that the students seldom participate in activities where the language used is French. As indicated previously, French is the classroom and possibly the school language, if it is in an Immersion setting.

G) Parental Attitudes and Motivation(1)

Parents were asked in which type of programme their other school-aged children were enrolled. Of these children, the percentage of those enrolled in a French immersion programme ranges from 61 to 100% of the different groups. There are two exceptions to this general pattern. In grade 3, parents from the total early immersion programme in the Français school and parents who have enrolled their children in the late immersion programme tend not to enroll their other children in the French immersion programme (see Tables A2, A3 and A4 in Appendix 7).

Analyses of the parents' first language, the languages spoken at home and the parents' ability to speak French indicate that approximately 15% of parents have French as their mother tongue, while English is the first language of 70% of all parents. Another language was the mother tongue of approximately 15% of all parents (see Tables A5 to A28 in Appendix 7). At the grade 6 level, one exception to this general pattern is noted. For the partial immersion group in the English setting (group 4), 30% of fathers and 40% of mothers list French as their first language spoken and still understood.

(1) See questionnaire in Appendix 5

More parents whose children are or have been in total immersion programmes have learned French as a second language compared to partial immersion programmes. Furthermore, for students enrolled in a total immersion programme in the Immersion setting, their brothers and sisters have a greater tendency to use French at home.

Tables 38, 39 and 40 present the parents' attitudes towards various concepts by groups for grades 3, 6 and 9 respectively.

The first two questions deal with the immersion setting. Parents of children in an Immersion setting agree that the setting in which their child is enrolled is generally better. These parents strongly agree that the best setting is one in which only the French immersion programme is offered. Parents who have children in an English setting or in a Français school tend to be indifferent or to disagree with this statement. Parents who have enrolled their children in the total French immersion programme think that this programme offers a good educational challenge and they moderately agree that French will help their child to understand English better.

Variables measuring aspects of instrumental motivation (the desire to gain social recognition or economic advantages through knowledge of French), attitudes towards French Canadians, and integrative motivation (a willingness to be like the members of the French community) follow a similar pattern. Parents who have enrolled their children in a total immersion programme or in a late immersion programme display stronger instrumental motivation, more positive attitudes towards French Canadians and a better appreciation of the French culture.

TABLE 38

PARENTAL ATTITUDES, BY GROUP - GRADE 3

Attitude \ Group	1 N=34	2 N=32	3 N=47	4 N=15	5 N=15	6 N=10
Child's school provides a better setting than other types of French immersion settings	1.97	2.04	1.41	2.47	2.29	2.10
Best immersion setting is when only the French immersion programme exists	1.85	1.53	1.43	3.00	3.93	2.30
French offers child educational challenge	1.37	1.06	1.32	1.14	2.00	2.20
French helps child understand own language better	1.91	1.84	1.91	1.79	3.27	2.20
French will help travel in French-speaking area	1.32	1.81	1.45	1.47	1.80	1.80
French will provide child with better job	1.29	1.31	1.45	1.60	1.73	1.40
French will get child greater respect	2.14	2.88	2.68	2.93	3.20	3.00
Non-French should learn French	3.00	3.63	2.89	3.47	3.27	3.20
French is important because Canada is bilingual	1.37	1.75	1.60	2.21	2.27	2.20
French will help child associate with French Canadians	1.79	2.16	1.87	2.47	2.33	2.10
French will help child understand French Canadians	1.94	2.25	2.04	2.47	3.20	2.30
French helps child appreciate French problems in Canada	2.38	2.97	2.55	3.47	3.36	2.80
Loss of French culture would be a great loss	1.47	1.78	1.43	1.80	2.60	1.70
French-Canadian heritage important part of Canadian identity	1.54	2.00	1.53	1.79	2.40	2.20
Learning French does not make child question child's belonging to own culture	1.62	1.87	1.51	1.71	1.93	2.80

SCALE: 1) Strongly agree - 2) Moderately agree
3) Indifferent - 4) Moderately disagree - 5) Strongly disagree

TABLE 39

PARENTAL ATTITUDES, BY GROUP - GRADE 6

Attitude \ Group	1 N=20	2 N=21	3 N=6	4 N=11
Child's school provides a better setting than other types of French immersion settings	1.63	1.25	2.60	2.56
Best immersion setting is when only the French immersion programme exists	1.10	1.45	3.00	3.22
French offers child educational challenge	1.25	1.48	1.83	2.00
French helps child understand own language better	2.15	2.33	2.33	3.11
French will help travel in French-speaking area	1.80	1.28	2.00	1.89
French will provide child with better job	1.35	1.29	1.00	1.56
French will get child greater respect	2.25	2.57	3.00	2.67
Non-French should learn French	3.40	2.81	3.67	3.11
French is important because Canada is bilingual	1.80	1.60	2.00	2.11
French will help child associate with French Canadians	2.05	1.38	2.33	2.78
French will help child understand French Canadians	2.15	1.67	2.00	3.00
French helps child appreciate French problems in Canada	2.70	2.38	3.83	3.11
Loss of French culture would be a great loss	1.30	1.29	2.83	2.22
French-Canadian heritage important part of Canadian identity	1.60	1.43	2.00	2.33
Learning French does not make child question child's belonging to own culture	1.79	1.81	3.17	2.25

SCALE: 1) Strongly agree - 2) Moderately agree
3) Indifferent - 4) Moderately disagree - 5) Strongly disagree

TABLE 40

PARENTAL ATTITUDES, BY GROUP - GRADE 9

Attitude \ Group	1 N=9	2 N=8	3 N=31
Child's school provides a better setting than other types of French immersion settings	3.17	3.38	2.85
Best immersion setting is when only the French immersion programme exists	2.71	1.63	3.10
French offers child educational challenge	2.13	1.25	1.39
French helps child understand own language better	3.00	2.71	2.39
French will help travel in French-speaking area	1.67	1.63	1.81
French will provide child with better job	1.25	1.63	1.68
French will get child greater respect	2.38	2.63	2.90
Non-French should learn French	3.50	2.25	3.23
French is important because Canada is bilingual	2.00	1.63	1.84
French will help child associate with French Canadians	2.11	2.00	1.90
French will help child understand French Canadians	2.50	2.13	2.43
French helps child appreciate French problems in Canada	3.00	2.38	2.63
Loss of French culture would be a great loss	1.88	1.38	1.60
French-Canadian heritage important part of Canadian identity	1.88	1.38	1.73
Learning French does not make child question child's belonging to own culture	2.25	1.29	1.55

SCALE: 1) Strongly agree - 2) Moderately agree
3) Indifferent - 4) Moderately disagree - 5) Strongly disagree

Parents of students in total French immersion programmes consider it important that their child participate in activities in which French is used. Table 41 indicates that for the total immersion groups at the grades 3 and 6 levels, 80% to 95% of parents think that participation is important. At these grade levels, 53% to 68% of parents with children in partial immersion programmes or in total immersion programmes in an English setting think that it is important.

At the grade 3 level, approximately one-fifth to one-third of the parents report that students in each group have participated in activities in which French was used. At the grade 6 level, participation is related to the programme. Approximately 70% of the students in the total immersion programmes have participated in activities in which French was used; 20% of the students in partial immersion programmes have done so.

At the grade 9 level, 45% of the students in early partial immersion and 85% of the students in the late immersion or the early total immersion group have participated, during the last three years, in activities in which French was used.

TABLE 41

PERCENTAGE OF PARENTS WHOSE CHILD HAS PARTICIPATED IN ACTIVITIES IN FRENCH AND IMPORTANCE OF ACTIVITIES, BY GRADE

GRADE 3

Caracteristics \ Group	1 N=35	2 N=31	3 N=46	4 N=15	5 N=15	6 N=10
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Participation during last three years	28.6	22.6	43.5	33.3	20.0	30.0
Importance of participation	91.2	80.6	84.4	53.3	64.3	80.0

GRADE 6

Participation \ Group	1 N=20	2 N=20	3 N=6	4 N=10
	%	%	%	%
Participation during last three years	65.0	75.0	16.7	20.0
Importance of participation	80.0	95.0	66.7	68.4

GRADE 9

Participation \ Group	1 N=9	2 N=8	3 N=31
	%	%	%
Participation during last three years	44.4	87.5	83.3
Importance of participation	77.8	87.5	65.5

Tables 42 to 44 indicate that parents feel their children rarely encounter situations in which they use the French they have learned. The parents' perception of the use of French by their child corroborates the students' perception on these items. Generally, students in grade 3 sometimes watch French television, listen to French radio or read French non-classroom material. These activities decrease by grade level from grade 3 to grade 9.

Parents give several reasons why they wish their child would (or could) participate in more activities in which they are exposed to the French language. The major reasons given are that the activities help the child use the language in a less structured or in a more natural situation and that greater fluency is attained. Parents indicate that they have some difficulty finding activities in which French is used.

TABLE 42

PARENTS' PERCEPTION OF THEIR CHILD'S PARTICIPATION IN ACTIVITIES BY GROUP - GRADE 3

Activity \ Group	1 N=35	2 N=31	3 N=46	4 N=15	5 N=15	6 N=10
Watch French-language programme	3.37	3.50	3.26	3.53	3.73	3.70
Listen to French radio station	4.57	4.59	4.36	4.67	4.80	5.00
Read French newspapers and magazines outside of classroom	3.51	3.72	3.75	4.13	4.60	3.70
Have opportunity to speak French	2.86	3.06	3.21	3.27	3.40	2.80
Read French-language books that are not textbooks used in class	2.63	2.91	2.92	3.27	4.20	3.90

1) Most of the time - 2) Often - 3) Sometimes

4) Hardly ever - 5) Never

TABLE 43

PARENTS' PERCEPTION OF THEIR CHILD'S PARTICIPATION IN ACTIVITIES

BY GROUP - GRADE 6

Activity \ Group	1 N=20	2 N=21	3 N=6	4 N=10
Watch French-language programmes	3.75	3.52	3.50	3.50
Listen to French radio station	4.60	4.00	4.67	4.40
Read French newspapers and magazines outside of classroom	3.75	3.67	3.67	4.10
Have opportunity to speak French	3.10	3.24	3.67	3.30
Read French-language books that are not textbooks used in class	3.00	2.86	3.50	4.00

TABLE 44

PARENTS' PERCEPTION OF THEIR CHILD'S PARTICIPATION IN ACTIVITIES

BY GROUP - GRADE 9

Activity \ Group	1 N=9	2 N=8	3 N=31
Watch French-language programmes	4.00	3.63	4.03
Listen to French radio station	4.56	4.38	4.39
Read French newspapers and magazines outside of classroom	4.22	4.13	4.32
Have opportunity to speak French	2.67	3.25	3.61
Read French-language books that are not textbooks used in class	4.22	3.75	3.97

1) Most of the time - 2) Often - 3) Sometimes

4) Hardly ever - 5) Never

Table 45 indicates that parents are very satisfied with the total immersion programme (grade 3, groups 1, 2, 3, 4, 6; grade 6, groups 1 and 2) and moderately satisfied with the partial immersion programme at the elementary levels. At the grade 9 level, parents of the late immersion students are moderately satisfied. However, those of early partial or early total now in partial immersion are indifferent to moderately dissatisfied.

All parents who have children enrolled in the French immersion programmes at the grade 3 level want their children to remain in the programme except for a few in the partial immersion programme and in the total French immersion programme in the Français school (Table 46). In all groups except group 6, approximately 60% to 85% of the parents indicate that they would like their child to continue in the immersion programme to the end of high school and to be able to pursue studies at the university level.

Table 47 presents similar results for parents of grade 6 students. Approximately one-third of the parents indicate that they want their child to continue to the end of grade 9. In grade 9, approximately 80% of parents want their child to continue in French immersion; of these, over 90% indicate that they would like their child to be able to continue until the end of high school (Table 48).

TABLE 45

PARENTS' SATISFACTION WITH CHILD'S FRENCH IMMERSION PROGRAMME

BY GROUP AND GRADE

Grade \ Group	1 N=35	2 N=32	3 N=47	4 N=15	5 N=15	6 N=10
Grade 3	1.29	1.34	1.32	1.53	2.20	1.40
Grade 6	1.50	1.35	1.90	1.19	----	----
Grade 9	3.29	3.25	2.10	----	----	----

1) Very satisfied
2) Moderately satisfied
3) Neither satisfied, nor dissatisfied
4) Moderately dissatisfied
5) Very dissatisfied

TABLE 46

PARENTS' DECISION TO ENROLL THEIR CHILD IN FRENCH IMMERSION AND LEVEL

ANTICIPATED, BY GROUP - GRADE 3

Decision \ Group	1 N=35	2 N=32	3 N=46	4 N=14	5 N=15	6 N=10
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Yes	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	86.7	80.0
No	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.3	20.0

If yes, level \ Group	1 N=35	2 N=32	3 N=46	4 N=14	5 N=13	6 N=8
	%	%	%	%	%	%
End of grade 6	2.9	12.9	6.8	14.3	7.7	50.0
End of grade 9	14.3	25.8	11.4	0.0	7.7	25.0
End of grade 12	51.4	32.3	36.4	50.0	61.5	12.5
University	31.4	29.0	43.2	35.7	23.1	12.5

TABLE 47

PARENTS' DECISION TO ENROLL THEIR CHILD IN FRENCH IMMERSION AND LEVEL ANTICIPATED, BY GROUP - GRADE 6

Decision \ Group	1 N=19	2 N=21	3 N=6	4 N=10
	%	%	%	%
Yes	100.0	95.2	83.3	90.0
No	0.0	4.8	16.7	10.0
If yes, level \ Group	**1 N=19**	**2 N=20**	**3 N=5**	**4 N=10**
	%	%	%	%
End of grade 6	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0
End of grade 9	36.8	30.0	40.0	30.0
End of grade 12	31.6	30.0	40.0	40.0
University	31.6	40.0	20.0	20.0

TABLE 48

PARENTS' DECISION TO ENROLL THEIR CHILD IN FRENCH IMMERSION AND LEVEL ANTICIPATED, BY GROUP - GRADE 9

Decision \ Group	1 N=9	2 N=8	3 N=31
	%	%	%
Yes	77.8	87.5	83.9
No	22.2	12.5	16.1
If yes, level \ Group	**1 N=8**	**2 N=7**	**3 N=26**
	%	%	%
End of grade 6	-	-	-
End of grade 9	12.5	0.0	7.7
End of grade 12	37.5	28.6	57.7
University	50.0	71.4	34.6

The analysis of the transportation modes of students indicates great differences among groups (Tables 49 to 51). The mode of transportation is related to school division policy (see Appendix 5 for a summary of the transportation policies by school division).

Parents are generally satisfied with the mode of transportation used by their children. However, the level of satisfaction is also related to the proximity of the school if the child walks, to the availability of school bus transportation and, in some cases, to the use of public transit.

In grade 3, from 71 to 100% of parents indicate they are satisfied with the mode of transportation used by their child (question 23 on the parent questionnaire - see Appendix 5). However, when asked to comment on the mode of transportation used by their child, approximately 25% of parents in group 1, 50% of parents in group 3 and 25% in group 4 indicated they would like to have a school bus. In grade 3, table 49 indicates that 32% of group 1 students, 81% of group 3 and 20% of group 4 students use public transit or are transported by automobile.

The level of satisfaction expressed by parents ranges from 90% to 100% in grade 6. Approximately 25% of parents in group 2 express the wish to have school buses for their children. Table 50 indicates that 86% of their children use public transit or are transported by car.

In grade 9, approximately 25% of parents of groups 1 and 2 indicate they would like bus service or a better bus service for their children. In summary, parents generally accept what is available to them as a transportation mode for their children. Some parents indicate that bussing by the school division is an important factor in their decision to enroll their children in an immersion programme in the early grades (K to 2). For those who have school bus transportation provided to the end of grade 6, it remains an important factor in their decision.

Since we are addressing only the population enrolled in a French immersion programme, it is not possible to determine accurately to what extent the lack of transportation influences the parents' decision to enroll their children in an immersion programme. However, approximately 25% of parents who have enrolled their children in French immersion in school divisions where school bus transportation is provided in grades 3 and 6 indicate that if this mode of transportation were not provided, their child could not continue in the French immersion programme.

TABLE 49

STUDENTS' MODE OF TRANSPORTATION AND PARENTAL SATISFACTION, BY GROUP

GRADE 3

Mode \ Group	N=35 1	N=32 2	N=47 3	N=15 4	N=15 5	N=10 6
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Walk	28.6	34.4	4.3	60.0	13.3	20.0
School bus	40.0	59.4	14.9	20.0	86.7	80.0
Public transit	22.9	0.0	59.6	6.7	0.0	0.0
Automobile	8.6	6.3	21.3	13.3	0.0	0.0
Other	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Satisfaction	78.8	83.9	71.7	71.4	100.0	90.0

TABLE 50

STUDENTS' MODE OF TRANSPORTATION AND PARENTAL SATISFACTION, BY GROUP

GRADE 6

Mode \ Group	N=20 1	N=21 2	N=6 3	N=10 4
	%	%	%	%
Walk	25.0	14.3	50.0	60.0
School bus	75.0	0.0	16.7	30.0
Public transit	0.0	57.1	33.3	0.0
Automobile	0.0	28.6	0.0	10.0
Satisfaction	89.5	90.5	100.0	88.9

TABLE 51

STUDENTS' MODE OF TRANSPORTATION AND PARENTAL SATISFACTION, BY GROUP

GRADE 9

Mode \ Group	N=9 1	N=8 2	N=31 3
	%	%	%
Walk	55.6	12.5	90.3
School bus	11.1	12.5	0.0
Public transit	22.2	50.0	9.7
Automobile	11.1	25.0	0.0
Satisfaction	62.5	87.5	96.7

H) Teachers' Characteristics

Two groups of teachers were created according to the type of setting in which they were teaching. Teachers included in the analyses are not only those who teach in grades 3, 6 and 9, but all teachers who teach immersion students in the participating school divisions. The object of the following analysis is to study the differences in the two settings from a teacher's perspective.

Teachers were asked questions relating to their teaching experience, their language background, programme information, the use of French in the school and the goals of their immersion programme. Homeroom teachers were also asked questions regarding their homeroom classes. French-language teachers responded to questions on their objectives for the French-language development of their students.

Table 52 indicates that teachers in the Immersion setting have an average of ten years' teaching experience, whereas teachers in the English setting have eight. A test of differences among means, correcting for unequal cells, does not indicate a significant difference at the .05 level.

Teachers in the English setting have more experience in teaching English in a regular English programme or in teaching the core French programme (Table 53). Furthermore, they have more experience at the junior high and high school levels. This difference is primarily due to the fact that more immersion programmes at these levels (grades 7 to 12) are in English settings.

TABLE 52

TEACHING EXPERIENCE, BY SETTING

Characteristic \ Setting	English setting	Immersion setting
Average number of years' experience	8.129	10.294
Standard deviation	7.424	7.113
Minimum	1	1
Maximum	26	29
Number of teachers	33	70

TABLE 53

AVERAGE NUMBER OF YEARS' TEACHING EXPERIENCE, BY LEVEL, PROGRAMME AND SETTING

Type of programme and setting	Grade	K-3	4-6	7-9	10-12
Teaching in English in regular English programme	English setting	6.67 N=3	5.14 N=7	3.87 N=7	5.8 N=5
	Immersion setting	4.60 N=20	3.35 N=17	3.56 N=16	3.75 N=4
Teaching in English in French immersion programme	English setting	3.0 N=3	1.0 N=4	0.0 N=0	0.0 N=0
	Immersion setting	2.79 N=14	2.31 N=16	1.50 N=4	0.0 N=0
Teaching the core French programme	English setting	2.25 N=4	2.33 N=9	4.58 N=12	4.11 N=9
	Immersion setting	2.56 N=9	2.15 N=13	2.67 N=12	4.50 N=2
Teaching French in French immersion programme	English setting	2.36 N=11	2.40 N=5	2.58 N=12	2.40 N=5
	Immersion setting	2.98 N=44	2.57 N=23	1.33 N=6	2.00 N=1
Teaching English in Français programme	English setting	1.0 N=1	1.0 N=1	1.0 N=1	0.0 N=0
	Immersion setting	3.17 N=12	3.88 N=8	3.60 N=5	0.0 N=0
Teaching French in Français programme	English setting	0.0 N=0	3.5 N=2	1.0 N=1	4.0 N=2
	Immersion setting	4.07 N=14	3.67 N=12	2.71 N=7	0.0 N=0
Special role	English setting	1.0 N=1	0.0 N=0	0.0 N=0	0.0 N=0
	Immersion setting	4.0 N=3	4.0 N=3	3.5 N=0	6.0 N=1

Teachers in the Immersion setting have more experience in the teaching of English in French immersion, in the teaching of French in French immersion and the teaching of English in the Français programme.

The general observation is that teachers in the Immersion setting have relatively more experience in immersion programmes.

Table 54 indicates that one-third of the teachers in the Immersion setting have taken their primary and secondary grades exclusively in English, whereas two-thirds of the teachers in the English setting have done so.

TABLE 54

LANGUAGE MEDIUM OF INSTRUCTION, BY LEVEL AND SETTING

Level and Setting \ Language medium		English	French	English and French	Others
Primary	English setting N =	19 (58.%)	10 (30.%)	4 (12.%)	0 (0%)
	Immersion setting N =	27 (39.%)	27 (39.%)	15 (21.%)	1 (1.%)
Secondary	English setting N =	23 (70.%)	7 (21.%)	3 (9.%)	0 (0%)
	Immersion setting N =	25 (36.%)	23 (33.%)	21 (30.%)	1 (1.%)
University	English setting N =	13 (39.%)	11 (33.%)	9 (27.%)	0 (0%)
	Immersion setting N =	21 (32.%)	27 (42.%)	17 (26.%)	0 (0%)
Teacher training	English setting N =	13 (42.%)	12 (39.%)	6 (19.%)	0 (0%)
	Immersion setting N =	35 (51.%)	22 (32.%)	12 (17.%)	0 (0%)

Approximately one-third of all teachers have studied exclusively in English at the university level. Once again, this is somewhat more true of teachers in the English setting than those in the Immersion setting. In their teacher training, 51% of the teachers in the Immersion setting and 42% of those in the English setting indicated they followed a programme exclusively in English.

The analysis of the teacher training experience by type of programme, subject, setting and level is presented in Table 55. Teachers reported the professional courses or parts of courses that they had taken to obtain their teaching certificate. The tables providing information on teacher training, formal studies and professional development are based on self report data from the teacher's questionnaire. This analysis is influenced by the greater proportion of immersion programmes in grades 7 to 12 in the English setting.

Approximately 75% of the teachers in either setting reported that they received training for the teaching of English, French or other subjects in the regular English programme.

For the Français programme, teachers in the English setting reported that they received less training than those in the Immersion setting. In the English setting, approximately one-third received training to teach English Language Arts, one-half to teach French Language Arts and one-fifth to teach other subjects in the Français programme. In the Immersion setting, more than half (55%) of the teachers received training to teach English Language Arts, three-quarters (73.9%) to teach French Language Arts and 60% to teach other subjects in the Français programme.

TABLE 55

SELF-REPORTED TEACHER TRAINING, BY PROGRAMME, SUBJECT, SETTING AND LEVEL

Programme	Subject	English setting		Immersion setting	
		Element.	Second.	Element.	Second.
		%	%	%	%
Regular English	English language arts	60.0	16.0	70.9	9.1
	French language arts	38.1	33.3	53.2	17.0
	Other subjects	40.0	40.0	62.2	18.9
Français	English language arts	16.7	16.7	55.0	0.0
	French language arts	36.8	15.8	67.7	5.2
	Other subjects	11.1	11.1	8.0	52.0
French immersion	English language arts	26.3	10.5	20.7	0.0
	French language arts	29.5	25.0	32.9	1.4
	Other subjects	25.0	16.7	13.3	0.0
	N =	33		70	

Less than half the teachers in either setting reported that they received training to teach in an immersion programme during their professional teacher training programme. However, in this case, the proportions are inversed. Teachers in the English setting reported having received more training than those in the Immersion setting.

Since their teacher training, one-fifth to one-half of the teachers in either setting reported having taken courses in the teaching of English or other subjects in the regular English programme, French Language Arts in the Français programme or French Language Arts or other subjects in the French immersion programme (Table 56).

The professional development activities of teachers in either setting has been concentrated on the immersion programme (Table 57). Virtually all teachers report having taken part in professional development sessions on the teaching of French Language Arts and other subjects in the French immersion programme.

TABLE 56

SELF-REPORTED FORMAL STUDIES, BY PROGRAMME, SUBJECT, SETTING AND LEVEL

		English setting		Immersion setting	
Programme	Subject	Element.	Second.	Element.	Second.
		%	%	%	%
Regular English	English language arts	22.2	5.6	22.2	0.0
	French language arts	11.5	11.5	19.4	13.9
	Other subjects	22.2	0.0	34.4	15.6
Français	English language arts	7.1	7.1	7.7	0.0
	French language arts	26.7	13.3	44.4	6.7
	Other subjects	0.0	12.5	27.3	0.0
French immersion	English language arts	10.5	0.0	11.4	0.0
	French language arts	12.5	22.5	37.5	4.2
	Other subjects	25.0	16.7	15.8	5.3
	N =	33		70	

TABLE 57

SELF-REPORTED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT, BY PROGRAMME, SUBJECT, SETTING AND LEVEL

		English setting		Immersion setting	
Programme	Subject	Element.	Second.	Element.	Second.
		%	%	%	%
Regular English	English language arts	38.5	23.1	56.0	3.6
	French language arts	25.0	53.6	44.1	5.9
	Other subjects	40.0	40.0	58.6	3.4
Français	English language arts	0.0	0.0	36.5	1.9
	French language arts	20.8	37.5	63.5	4.1
	Other subjects	0.0	33.4	65.8	2.6
French immersion	English language arts	12.5	0.0	46.2	0.0
	French language arts	50.0	46.6	83.6	5.4
	Other subjects	70.0	30.0	91.7	1.7
N =		33		70	

Teachers in the Immersion setting report having attended a greater variety of sessions for all programmes than did the teachers in the English setting. Since teachers were not asked whether they had attended these sessions since they had started teaching in the French immersion programme, they could have participated for previous teaching assignments.

Table 58 indicates that 84% of the teachers in the English setting and 75% of those in the Immersion setting have had experiences which they feel increased their French language competency. However, teachers in the Immersion setting report that they use French more often at home, in their social contacts and in their professional contacts than do the teachers in the English setting.

The teachers described their teaching setting (e.g. open area, closed classroom, team teaching) and indicated the type in which they preferred to teach. Approximately 90% of all the teachers work in a closed classroom and they prefer to remain in this type of setting. Those who teach in an open area would prefer to teach in a closed classroom setting. All indicate that the closed classroom allows children to learn more with less distraction (Question 9).

Approximately 70% of teachers in the English setting report having some kind of help in their classroom (question 11). This help is either a teacher's aide, monitors or lab assistants, or volunteers. Only 30% of the teachers in the Immersion setting report having additional help. However, 80% of the teachers in both settings are satisfied with their situation.

TABLE 58

SELF-REPORTED EXPERIENCES SAID TO HAVE

INCREASED FRENCH LANGUAGE COMPETENCY, BY SETTING

Setting / Experience	English setting	Immersion setting
	83.9% N=33	75.4% N=70
	%	%
Québec vacation	3.8	32.7
Courses in Québec (Bain)	23.1	16.3
France, visit-course	30.8	22.4
Social contacts, theatre	30.8	12.2
Courses in French	15.4	16.3
Teaching in French	15.4	14.3
Others	11.5	8.2

If teachers in the English setting must be absent from their class for a day, the person who takes over their duties does not use the same language as they would. More than half of the time (53.1%), the replacement will use English instead of French. Only half the teachers (46.9%) are satisfied with this arrangement.

In the Immersion setting, if the classroom teacher must be absent, the teacher will always be replaced by a person who will use the same language. Approximately 85% of the teachers in this setting are satisfied with these arrangements.

Teachers were asked to evaluate the curriculum guides available for different subjects (Table 59). Teachers find that the

TABLE 59

TEACHERS' EVALUATION OF CURRICULUM GUIDES, BY SUBJECT AND SETTING

Subject and setting / Evaluation		Adequate and suitable	Suitable but not enough	not suitable	non-existent
		%	%	%	%
French language arts	English	52.2	21.7	4.3	21.7
	Immersion	64.0	10.0	14.0	12.0
English language arts	English	90.0	0.0	9.1	0.0
	Immersion	88.6	5.7	2.9	2.9
Mathematics	English	90.5	0.0	0.0	9.5
	Immersion	89.6	8.3	2.1	0.0
Science	English	56.3	18.8	12.5	12.5
	Immersion	53.3	20.0	26.7	0.0
Social studies	English	63.2	10.5	15.8	10.5
	Immersion	65.2	17.4	13.0	4.3

curriculum guides in English Language Arts and Mathematics are adequate and suitable. However, in French Language Arts, approximately 60% of all teachers indicate that the curriculum guides are adequate and suitable. From 10% to 20% of teachers find them suitable but not enough. Teachers in the English setting (many of them at the high school level) find that the curriculum guides are nonexistent (21.7%). Furthermore, for Science, Social Studies and French Language Arts, approximately 25% of teachers find the guides not suitable or nonexistent.

Tables A-29 to A-32 in Appendix 7 present the evaluation of curriculum guides by teachers according to the level at which they are teaching. Four levels were created: level 1 involves teachers in kindergarten to grade 3; level 2, teachers from grades 4 to 6; level 3, teachers from grades 7 to 9 and level 4, teachers from grades 10 to 12.

Few differences are observed between teachers in either setting at the first level. However, at the levels of grades 4 to 6 and grades 7 to 9, teachers in the English setting indicate more frequently that the curriculum guides in French Language Arts and Social Studies are not suitable or are nonexistent.

Table 60 presents the teachers' evaluation of textbooks by subject and setting. For French Language Arts, more than half the teachers in either setting find the textbooks adequate and suitable while 24% of teachers in the English setting and 35% of those in the Immersion setting feel there aren't enough.

TABLE 60

TEACHERS' EVALUATION OF TEXTBOOKS, BY SUBJECT AND SETTING

Subject and setting / Evaluation		Adequate and suitable	Suitable but not enough	not suitable	non-existent
		%	%	%	%
French language arts	English	60.0	24.0	12.0	4.0
	Immersion	52.2	34.8	8.7	4.3
English language arts	English	84.6	15.1	0.0	0.0
	Immersion	84.4	12.5	3.1	0.0
Mathematics	English	81.8	9.1	9.1	0.0
	Immersion	86.4	9.1	2.3	2.3
Science	English	43.8	12.5	37.5	6.3
	Immersion	27.5	22.5	40.0	10.0
Social studies	English	36.4	27.3	27.3	9.1
	Immersion	48.8	24.4	12.2	0.0

For English Language Arts, 85% of the teachers find the textbooks suitable while approximately 15% find there aren't enough. A similar pattern is observed for Mathematics. Approximately 50% of the teachers in either setting indicate that the textbooks in Science are either not suitable or nonexistent. In Social Studies, the level of satisfaction is somewhat higher. However, 25% of teachers in either setting indicate that the textbooks are suitable but that there aren't enough. Teachers in the English setting (27.3%) feel that the textbooks are not suitable, whereas 12.2% of teachers in an Immersion setting find them so.

Tables A-33 to A-36 present the teachers' evaluation of the texbooks according to the level at which they are teaching. The levels used in the analyses of the curriculum guides are maintained.

In the two first levels (K to grade 3 and grades 4 to 6), teachers in the Immersion setting are more critical of the textbooks in French Language Arts, Science and Social Studies than teachers in the English setting. From 40% to 85% of teachers in the Immersion setting indicate that the textbooks in three subjects are either suitable but not enough, not suitable or nonexistent.

At the grade 7 to 9 level, teachers in the English setting are more critical of the textbooks in all subjects. From 50% to 100% indicate that the textbooks are suitable but not enough, not suitable or nonexistent.

Teachers in either setting indicate that backup resources are adequate and suitable or suitable but not enough (approximately 50% in both cases, Table 61). Only radio and T.V. broadcasts are not evaluated as positively. Approximately 25% of teachers feel that what is presented is not suitable.

Tables A-37 to A-40 present the teachers' evaluation of backup resources available to them. Few differences are observed between settings at the K to grade 3 and grades 4 to 6 levels. At the grades 7 to 9 and grades 10 to 12 levels, up to 53.8% of teachers in the English setting find that the backup resources are adequate and suitable.

Teachers find that the school library or the resource centre provides enough material in English; 90% of all teachers are

TABLE 61

TEACHERS' EVALUATION OF BACKUP RESOURCES AVAILABLE, BY SETTING

Resources and setting / Evaluation		Adequate and suitable	Suitable but not enough	not suitable	non-existent
		%	%	%	%
Film, filmstrips, etc.	English	46.7	46.7	6.7	0.0
	Immersion	59.7	37.1	1.6	1.6
Records and tapes	English	54.2	41.7	4.2	0.0
	Immersion	61.0	35.6	1.7	1.7
Radio and T.V. broadcasts	English	14.3	57.1	23.8	4.8
	Immersion	34.1	43.9	22.0	0.0
Posters and other visual aids	English	50.0	46.4	3.6	0.0
	Immersion	43.9	45.6	8.8	1.8
Cultural activities	English	29.2	66.7	4.2	0.0
	Immersion	46.5	46.5	7.0	0.0
Supplementary books	English	48.1	44.4	7.4	0.0
	Immersion	55.4	37.5	7.1	0.0

satisfied. However, only 45% of teachers in the English and 60% of teachers in the Immersion settings think that the library or resource centre provides enough books or materials to meet the pupils' needs in French (see question 18 in the teacher questionnaire).

Teachers were asked to evaluate the use of French in their school. Table 62 presents the percentage of materials displayed in French or the use of French in school events as perceived by them.

TABLE 62

TEACHERS' PERCEPTION OF THE USE OF FRENCH

IN MATERIALS DISPLAYED OR IN SCHOOL EVENTS, BY SETTING

Materials and events \ Setting	English setting	Immersion setting
	%	%
Materials displayed in classroom	87	86
Materials displayed in school corridors	21	92
Materials displayed on parents' night in classroom	85	87
Materials displayed on parents' night in whole school	36	88
School assemblies	16	93
School activities (e.g. sports days)	20	93
P.A. announcements	15	95
Conversation in the staff room	31	97
Staff meetings	16	100
Other	98	74

Teachers in the Immersion setting indicate that over 85% of the materials are in French while over 90% of the time French is the language used by the administration and in other conversations. In the English setting, teachers perceive that French is more or less restricted to the classroom. French is used approximately 25% of the time in the school, either in materials displayed or in verbal communication.

Students in the English setting use French less often in communicating with peers and teachers outside the classroom than do students in the Immersion setting (Table 63).

TABLE 63

TEACHERS' PERCEPTION OF USE OF THE FRENCH LANGUAGE

BY STUDENTS, BY SETTING*

Situation \ Setting	English setting	Immersion setting
To the teacher during lessons taught in French	1.100	1.063
To the teacher otherwise in the classroom	1.250	1.227
To the teacher outside the classroom	1.438	1.224
To the teacher during lessons taught in French	1.250	1.051
To other pupils during lessons taught in French	1.433	1.238
To other pupils otherwise in the classroom	1.733	1.400
To their own classmates outside the classroom	2.323	1.818
To other pupils in the school	2.600	1.785
To other members of the school staff	1.966	1.152

* 1 = often - 2 = sometimes - 3 = not at all

According to the teachers' perceptions, the ambiance in schools where only French immersion programmes exist is more French and more conducive to the use of French than it is in the English setting.

The teachers' perception of parents' reasons for enrolling their child in the French immersion programme is presented in Table 64.

Teachers feel that the major reasons for which parents enroll their children in a French immersion programme are that they think the student will obtain better jobs, as well as benefit from the inherent value of learning a second language and the additional scholastic challenge. Approximately half of the teachers also feel

that parents have enrolled their children for the contact with a second culture or for travel purposes.

TABLE 64

TEACHERS' PERCEPTION OF PARENTS' REASONS FOR ENROLLING THEIR CHILD IN THE FRENCH IMMERSION PROGRAMME, BY SETTING

Reason \ Setting	English setting	Immersion setting
	%	%
Get better job	84.8	80.0
Get along with Francophones	18.2	12.9
For travel purposes	48.5	38.5
Value of learning a second language	87.9	91.4
Special attention for child	15.2	12.9
Contact with second culture	51.5	68.6
Additionnal scholastic challenge	75.8	74.3

Teachers were asked in which language, type of programme and type of setting they would prefer to teach the following year (Question 25). Approximately 90% of teachers in both groups would prefer teaching in French. Teachers in the English setting indicated they would prefer teaching a total immersion programme (early or late, 75.1%); 6.3% would prefer a late partial immersion, a Français programme or indicated no preference. In the Immersion setting, 85.3% indicated they would prefer a total immersion programme while 4.4% indicated their preference for a Français programme and 5.9% indicated no preference. Furthermore, 80% of teachers in the English setting indicated they would prefer teaching in an Immersion setting; 95.5% of those in the Immersion setting indicated they prefered to remain in their setting.

Teachers in the English setting in partial immersion programmes indicated that the amount of time during which French is the language of instruction should be increased.

I) Principals' Characteristics

Principals were asked various questions dealing with their administrative experience, their language background, the school in which they were working and their perception of the French immersion programme.

Thirteen (13) principals and vice-principals completed the questionnaire; seven (7) were in the English setting, six (6) in the Immersion setting. Table 65 indicates that there is no significant difference between the average number of years experience of the

TABLE 65

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPERIENCE OF PRINCIPALS, BY TYPE OF SCHOOL AND SETTING

Type of school \ Setting	English	Immersion
English programme only	11.75 (4)	0.0 (6)
Français programme only	0.0 (7)	6.0 (2)
Both English and Français programmes	5.5 (2)	7.0 (4)
French immersion programme only	0.0 (7)	3.5 (4)
Both English and French immersion programmes	3.33 (6)	3.0 (1)
Both Français and French immersion programmes	0.0 (7)	3.33 (3)
Average administrative experience	11.20 (7)	11.67 (6)

principals in the two groups. However principals in the English setting have more experience administering schools where only the English programme was offered, whereas principals in the Immersion setting have more experience administering Français programmes or immersion programmes in their respective schools.

Table 66 indicates that principals in the Immersion setting were more exposed to French as the language of instruction during their public school, university and teacher training. All principals in the Immersion setting report having native-like command of French and either native-like command of English or an ability to speak it quite well. Principals in the English setting have native-like command of English but speak very little French.

From various statements, principals in either setting seem to be very committed to the French immersion programme. They feel it is a worthwhile programme which should be further developed. In

TABLE 66

LANGUAGE USED AS MEDIUM OF INSTRUCTION DURING PRINCIPALS' EDUCATION, BY SETTING

	Setting					
	English			Immersion		
Level / Lang	English N	French N	Both N	English N	French N	Both N
1 to 6	7	0	0	2	2	2
7 to 12	6	0	1	3	1	2
University	5	0	2	2	3	1
Teacher training	6	0	1	5	1	0

the English setting, principals feel that there are fewer resources available for the immersion programme than for the regular English programme. The greatest areas of concern are the library, resource materials and consultative personnel. Principals in the Immersion setting indicate less concern for these areas; the needs seem fulfilled, except for books and materials in the library or resource centres.

The principals' perception of French use in the school generally corroborates the teachers' perception (Table 67). There are differences for the English setting. Principals indicate a higher percentage of materials displayed in corridors and for special occasions. Teachers had indicated a higher percentage of French for school assemblies, activities, and pupils' interaction.

TABLE 67

PRINCIPALS' PERCEPTION OF FRENCH USAGE IN THE SCHOOL, BY SETTING

Activity \ Setting	English N=7	Immersion N=6
	%	%
Materials displayed in immersion classroom	94	91
Materials displayed in the corridors	32	88
Materials displayed for special occasions	49	84
School assemblies	14	92
School activities like sports days	4	95
P.A. announcements	12	80
Pupils' interactions with teachers other than their own	20	80
Pupils' interactions in the office	8	93
Conversation in the staff room	31	98
Teachers' meetings	30	100

If they could choose freely, principals in the Immersion setting would administer immersion programmes, either early (83.3%) or late (16.7%). They all would rather be in an immersion school (Immersion setting). Half of the principals in the English setting would prefer to administer a regular English programme only. One principal indicated a preference for early total immersion in an immersion school. This factor is related to a sense of ease in the French language.

The principals' perception of parental motivation to enroll their child in French immersion indicates that they are very much in tune with parents. They state, as parents do, that students enroll in French immersion primarily for the inherent value of learning a second language, for better jobs and for the additional scholastic challenge.

Principals feel that parents are generally satisfied with the French immersion programme. However, some principals feel that parents who have had their child enrolled in a total immersion programme in an Immersion setting at the elementary level, are less enthusiastic about the programme at the junior high and high school levels in an English setting. They feel that this question must be resolved if the programme is to live up to long-term parental expectations. Most principals in either setting indicate that the best setting for an immersion programme (either early or late) is an Immersion setting in which all students are in a homogeneous immersion programme. In their opinion, this arrangement would be easier to administer and more profitable to the students.

Principals in either setting indicate that immersion pupils are generally not encouraged to leave the programme. They feel that the only reason, especially at the junior high and high school levels, to warrant a transfer to another programme is the absence of motivation on the part of the student. If students do transfer out of the immersion programme, it is the opinion of the principals that they adjust fairly quickly.

All principals agree that the administrative work associated with the French immersion programme is either justified or more than compensated by its value. Table 68 presents the administrative areas which create more difficulty than a non-immersion programme.

More than 50% of principals in the English setting indicate that they have more difficulty getting resource materials, finding substitute teachers and giving professional development to teachers. In the Immersion setting, principals indicate that they have greater difficulty with getting basic programmes established, public relations, bussing and transportation and crowding in the school. As indicated previously, all principals think that the extra work or the greater difficulties are justified or more than compensated for by the value of the programme.

Principals in both settings indicate that the objectives of their French immersion programme are:

1) to develop the functional bilingual competence of students
2) to ensure that students develop English language skills and basic skills in other subject areas equivalent to those of students in a regular English programme.

TABLE 68

PRINCIPALS' PERCEPTION OF ADMINISTRATIVE AREAS CREATING MORE DIFFICULTY IN THE IMMERSION PROGRAMME, BY SETTING

Area \ Setting	English N=7	Immersion N=6
Scheduling and timetabling	1	2
Getting basic programmes established	3	5
Getting resource materials	5	2
Hiring staff	3	2
Staff relations	2	1
Public relations	2	4
Parents' demands	4	2
Bussing and other transportation	1	5
Crowding in the school	0	3
Professional development of teachers	4	1
Finding substitute teachers	5	2
Absence of regular staff for meetings	2	0
Discipline problems	0	0
Pupil transfers	1	0
Organizing remedial programmes	1	1
Nature of physical facilities	0	2

Principals in the Immersion setting reported additional objectives, whereas the principals in the English setting did not. These objectives are:

3) to create a milieu in which the student feels at ease to communicate in French, thus increasing oral French skills

4) to increase the student's awareness and appreciation of the French culture and to develop more positive attitudes towards French Canadians.

VI - SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The object of the present research is to compare achievement in English language skills, in French language skills and in mathematics among French immersion groups in grades 3, 6 and 9, and between the immersion groups and a sample of students whose mother tongue is French. Different types of programmes (early or late, total or partial) in different settings (English or Immersion) are considered. Attitudes, motivation and characteristics of students, parents, teachers and principals are examined in relation to the types of programmes and settings.

The present summary is made across grades (and, where warranted, within a specific grade) for the achievement, linguistic, attitudinal and motivational results. The use of the covariates will be indicated when applicable.

A) English Language Achievement

The intelligence quotient and socio-economic status are the covariates used for within-group comparisons. At the grade 3 level, total French immersion groups in an Immersion setting obtained average to above average results in English Vocabulary and Reading, with percentiles ranging from 57 to 69. The partial immersion group in the English setting obtained lower results than the total immersion groups (except the one in the Français school); however, the differences were not always significant. The total immersion group in a Français school obtained results significantly lower than the other total immersion groups. The total immersion

groups obtained significantly higher results than the national norm mean, except the group in a Français school. This latter group and the partial immersion group did not obtain results significantly different from the national norm mean.

At the grade 6 level, the French immersion groups did not obtain results significantly different from one another. However, in English Reading, the total immersion groups in an Immersion setting obtained scores significantly higher than the national norm mean, whereas the partial immersion groups did not.

At the grade 9 level, all groups obtained average to above-average results in English. Although there are differences among groups (the early partial and late partial students obtained higher scores than the early total group), they were not significant. Differences in scores between the early total and the late partial groups could be a result of the highly selected population in the latter group. The early partial and late partial immersion groups obtained significantly higher results than the national norm mean.

B) Mathematics Achievement

The intelligence quotient and socio-economic status are the covariates used for within-immersion group comparisons. At the grade 3 level, the differences among groups in Maths Problems are not significant. However, the total immersion groups (except the one in the Français school) obtained significantly higher results than the national norm mean. In Maths Concepts, most of the differences are not significant, indicating that the groups are not different from one another and from the national norm mean. An

exception is the total immersion group in the Français school which obtained scores significantly lower than the national norm mean.

In grade 6, there are no significant differences among groups on the Maths Problems test. However, the total immersion groups obtained scores significantly higher than the national norm mean, whereas the partial immersion groups were not significantly different. In Maths Concepts, the partial immersion group in an English setting obtained scores significantly lower than the three other groups. Furthermore, the total immersion groups obtained scores significantly higher than the national norm mean.

In grade 9, the late partial and the early partial immersion groups (3 and 1) obtained results significantly higher than the early total immersion group (2) and the national norm mean. The early total immersion group (2) did not obtain results significantly different from the national norm mean. Furthermore, this group did not perform as well as the two partial immersion groups. As was the case for English language skills, differences observed could be a result of the highly selected group in late immersion.

C) French Language Achievement and Proficiency

French immersion groups were compared to a sample of students in Français schools whose mother tongue is French. Intelligence quotient and socio-economic status were the covariates used for comparisons within the French immersion groups.

On tests measuring achievement (Test de Français du Manitoba and Cloze test), at the grade 3 level, the French comparative

group obtained significantly higher scores than the French immersion groups. Total immersion groups in an Immersion setting obtained significantly higher results than the total immersion groups in other settings or the partial immersion group. The total immersion group in an English setting generally obtained higher results than the partial immersion group or the total immersion group in the Français school. The latter two groups were not significantly different.

At the grade 6 level, differences between the French comparative group and the total immersion groups in an Immersion setting have generally disappeared. However, these three groups obtained significantly higher results than the partial immersion group in an Immersion setting and the partial immersion group in the English setting.

At the grade 9 level, the French comparative group obtained significantly better results than the French immersion groups. Even though differences between the French immersion groups were not consistently significant, the early total group obtained generally higher results than the early partial or the late immersion groups. The equivalent performance of grade 6 students in the early total French immersion groups in an Immersion setting and the French comparative group is no longer observed at the grade 9 level. This result suggests the influence of the setting and programme (percentage of instruction time in French) on French language achievement.

On the Aural Comprehension test, the French comparative group obtained significantly better results than the French immersion groups at the grade 3 level. Total French immersion groups in

either setting obtained significantly better results than the partial immersion group. At the grade 6 level, no significant difference is found between the French comparative group and one of the total immersion groups in an Immersion setting. However, these three groups demonstrated significantly better aural comprehension skills than the partial immersion groups in either setting. At the grade 9 level, the French comparative group obtained significantly better results than the immersion groups. However, the early total group obtained significantly higher results than the late partial and the early partial immersion groups.

On the Writing Skills test at the grades 3 and 6 levels, there are generally no significant differences between the French comparative group and the total immersion groups in an Immersion or English setting. However, students in the partial immersion programme and those in the total immersion programme in a Français school obtained significantly lower results than the other groups. At the grade 6 level, the results of the total and partial immersion groups in the Immersion setting are not significantly different. At the grade 9 level, the French comparative group generally obtained better results than the French immersion groups on the Writing Skills test. However, the early partial group generally obtained significantly higher results than the early total or late partial groups. The two latter groups obtained similar results.

The Oral Production test was administered to a random sample of students in each group. At all grade levels, there were no significant differences between the French comparative group and

the French immersion groups on the comprehension scale. At the grade 3 level, French immersion students in the partial immersion group in the English setting are somewhat reluctant to communicate in French. Otherwise, no significant differences are observed at all grade levels on this scale. Differences between groups are observed at all grade levels on the pronunciation, grammar and syntax, vocabulary, and average total scales. On these scales, at the grade 3 level, the French comparative group obtained significantly higher scores than the immersion groups. Within-immersion group comparisons reveal that the total immersion groups in the Immersion setting and the Français school have similar results, significantly higher than groups in the English setting. The setting factor is more important than the programme factor. At the grade 6 level, within-immersion group differences generally disappear. However, at the grade 9 level, the early total immersion group obtained significantly higher scores than the early partial or late immersion groups.

D) General Characteristics

The evaluation of students' motivation and attitudes does not consistently indicate significant differences among groups. However, the analysis of the students' use of French indicates that the type of programme influences the use of French within the French class and the type of setting influences the use of French within the school. Total immersion groups use more French in conversations with their French teacher and with other students in the classroom

than do students in a partial immersion programme. Students in an Immersion setting or a Français school use French more often in the school than do students in an English setting. In all French immersion programmes, students rarely speak French outside the school.

Most of the students at the grades 3 and 6 levels want to continue in the immersion programme if they have a choice. The reasons usually given are that they are interested in learning another language and that they like French and enjoy speaking it. At the grade 6 level, an added incentive is the expectation of better job opportunities.

At the grade 9 level, approximately half the students in the early and late partial immersion programmes indicate either that they would like to quit the French immersion programme or that they don't know whether they want to continue. More students in the early total immersion group would definitely continue or would continue, depending on the options offered. Students in this group do not want to quit the immersion programme after so many years, and they indicate that they like French more than do those in the other immersion groups.

Parents are generally very supportive of the French immersion programme. However, those who have enrolled their children in a total immersion programme in an Immersion setting feel that this is the best setting for their child, more so than do parents who have enrolled their children in an English setting. Parents who have children in an Immersion setting feel that it is very important that their children participate in activities in French other than

those organized by the school. At the grade 3 and 6 levels, parents whose children are in partial immersion are less inclined to think that this is important.

Parents are generally very satisfied with the French immersion programme in which their children are enrolled. At least 90% of them want their children to continue in the immersion programme for at least another three years.

Except for parents of children in the total immersion programme in a Français school, most of the parents want their children to continue in the French immersion programme until at least the end of high school.

Most parents are satisfied with the transportation that is available to their children. However, there are indications that the divisions' transportation policy is influential during the first years of school. Since we are addressing only the population enrolled in a French immersion programme, it is not possible to determine accurately to what extent the lack of transportation influences parents' decision on whether to enroll their children in French immersion. However, approximatly 25% of the parents who have enrolled their children in French immersion in school divisions which provide school bus transportation in grades 3 and 6 indicate that, if this mode of transportation were not provided, their child could not continue in the French immersion programme.

Results on the teachers' and principals' questionnaires indicate that, in the Immersion setting, the ambiance is French, whereas, in the English setting, the use of French is more or less

restricted to the classroom. Teachers in either setting would prefer to teach a total French immersion programme. Furthermore, they would prefer to teach in an Immersion setting.

Principals in an English setting indicate that they have more difficulty obtaining adequate resource materials and library books than do those in the French setting. Furthermore, in the English setting, it is more difficult to arrange for the professional development of teachers and to find substitute teachers. Teachers in this setting are also less satisfied with the substitute teachers, essentially because they do not always speak French.

When knowledge of French is not a factor, principals would prefer to administer an immersion programme in an Immersion setting.

E) Conclusions

The results of this research are generally in agreement with those reported in Ontario and Québec.

Even though the numbers of students in different groups are unequal and not all types of programmes are offered in different settings, the general conclusion is that French immersion programmes have no negative effects on English language or mathematics achievement. At the grade 3 and 6 levels, total immersion groups tend to have higher scores than partial immersion groups in English and mathematics skills.

In French language achievement and proficiency, the early total immersion programme in an Immersion setting produces the best results. The programme and the setting are factors which influence

French language development. Students in a total immersion programme in an Immersion setting obtain the highest scores, followed by students in a total immersion programme in an English setting. Students in partial French immersion in an Immersion setting obtain results lower than those of the preceding group but higher than those of the partial immersion group in an English setting. No inferences can be made on Immersion programmes in a Français school. The group included in this study consists of one class and is the first cohort of students in this setting. Before conclusions can be drawn, further study of this situation must be undertaken.

Late immersion students (after three years) obtained results on French-language achievement and proficiency equivalent to students in an early partial immersion programme who had started in kindergarten.

Teachers, principals and parents indicate that, at the junior high and high school levels, better results can be obtained in French-language proficiency, without hindering achievement in the English language or other subjects, by offering the immersion programme in an Immersion setting.

F) Educational Implications

In this section, an attempt is made to identify the educational implications which arise from the study. These implications are drawn from the data provided by students, parents, teachers and principals. They are not presented in order of importance but rather as major elements of the most favorable conditions for learning French as a second language for school-aged children.

1) The setting

The French immersion programme should be offered in an Immersion setting. This setting is defined as a school in which only the French immersion programme is offered. The administration, teachers, specialists and support staff should speak French. Thus, the atmosphere of the school being French, the students are exposed to and encouraged to use French. If the physical facilities are shared with a regular English programme, the French immersion programme should be situated in one area of the school with its own administration, teachers, specialists and support staff. Recreational activities should be separate.

2) The programme

The total early French immersion programme provides the best overall type of programme for the learning of French as a second language without negative effects on English language and subject skills. The programme includes course content and extracurricular activities which are developed to increase French-language skills. Since French immersion students rarely use or have the opportunity to use French outside the classroom or the school situation (if it is in an Immersion setting), all aspects of the programme should be geared to the exposure to and use of French in natural situations as well as structured classroom instruction.

After three years in a late partial immersion programme, students have developed French-language competence equivalent to that obtained by students in an early partial immersion programme. Because of the absence of a late total immersion group, no inferences can be drawn on this type of programme.

N.B. The total French immersion programme in an Immersion setting are the two conditions which are necessary for the maximum benefits.

3) High school

The majority of parents and students would like to have the French immersion programme to the end of high school (grade 12). If the programme is to continue to this level, its success will depend on the number of options offered in grades 10 to 12.

If the objective is to offer in a French immersion high school, all options normally available in a regular high school English programme, a sufficient number of students would have to be enrolled. If, at the present time, enrollments do not permit an individual school division to offer a high school programme, school divisions should study procedures which would regroup students from different school divisions or provide and share common resources in order to attain this objective.

4) Teacher training and professional development

With the rapid increase of enrollment in French immersion programmes and the development of programmes and courses at the high school level, teacher training institutions must provide programmes, rather than isolated courses only, for the French immersion programme.

If teachers are to fulfill the objective, described by principals in Immersion settings, of increasing the students' awareness and appreciation of the French culture, they should receive relevant courses during their teacher training.

In terms of professional development, an integrated longitudinal in-service plan should be instituted rather than isolated days of instruction. All components related to the French immersion programme should be included.

5) Curriculum guides, textbooks and backup resources

Teachers in an English setting seem to be less aware than teachers in the Immersion setting of available curriculum guides, textbooks and backup resources. It is easier for teachers in Immersion settings to learn of existing resources and ways of using them, to share ideas and obtain adequate library resources than it is for teachers in English settings. Teachers, regardless of setting, are generally less satisfied with (or do no know) what is available in French Language Arts, Science and Social Studies, in comparison to Mathematics and English Language Arts. A study of the availability and adequacy of curriculum guides and textbooks in French Language Arts, Science and Social Studies should be undertaken.

At the high school level, if instruction in French is extended to a larger number of courses, great care should be taken to select or develop adequate materials.

6) Transportation

Approximately 25% of parents who have transportation provided by the school divisions for their children indicated that this is a decisive factor for them; without this transportation, their child could not continue in French immersion. What is not known is

how many parents have not enrolled their children in French immersion because the transportation policy of their school division was not supportive. If school divisions are interested in encouraging parents to enroll their children in French immersion, they should be aware that providing transportation is a decisive factor for at least 25% of parents.

7) Parents

Many parents indicated that one area of concern they had with the French immersion programme is their inability to help or to participate fully in their child's education because of their lack of knowledge of French. School divisions may wish to consider offering evening courses in French as a second language for parents.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Barik H.C. and Swain M., 1974
English-French Bilingual Education in the Early Grades: The Elgin Study, The Modern Language Journal, 58, 392-403

Barik H.C. and Swain M., 1975
Three-Year Evaluation of a Large Scale Early Grade French Immersion Program: The Ottawa Study, Language Learning, Vol. 25, N° 1

Barik H.C. and Swain M., 1976a
English-French Bilingual Education in the Early Grades: The Elgin Study Through Grade 4, The Modern Language Journal, Vol. 60, 3-17

Barik H.C. and Swain M., 1976b
Bilingual Education Project: Evaluation of the 1975-76 French Immersion Program in Grades 3-5, Ottawa Board of Education and Carleton Board of Education. (Toronto: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education) (mimeo)

Barik H.C. and Swain M., 1976c
A Longitudinal Study of Bilingual and Cognitive Development, The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. International Journal of Psychology, Vol. 11, N° 4

Barik H.C. and Swain M., 1977
French Immersion in Canada: The Ottawa Study Through Grade 4. ITL, A Review of Applied Linguistics, Vol. 36, 45-70

Barik H.C. and Swain M., 1978
Evaluation of French Immersion Program: The Ottawa Study Through Grade 5. Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science, Vol. 10, N° 3, 192-201

Blischen Bernard R., Feb. 1967
A Socio-Economic Index for Occupation in Canada, in The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, Vol. 4, N° 1, p. 50.

Clément R., Gardner R.C. and Smythe P.C., 1977a
Motivational Variables in Second Language Acquisition: A Study of Francophones Learning English. Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science, Vol. 9, N° 2

Clément R., Gardner R.C. and Smythe P.C., 1977b
Inter-Ethnic Contact: Attitudinal Consequences. Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science, Vol. 9, N° 3

Cummins J., 1976
The Influence of Bilingualism on Cognitive Growth: A Synthesis of Research Findings and Explanatory Hypotheses. Working Papers on Bilingualism, N° 9, 1-43

Cummins J., 1979
Cognitive/Academic Language Proficiency, Linguistic Interdependance, the Optimum Age Question and some other Matters Working Papers on Bilingualism, N° 19, 197-205

Edwards H.P. and Casserly M.C., 1976a
Research and Evaluation of Second Language (French) Programs, (Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education)

Edwards H.P. and Smyth F., 1976b
Evaluation of Second Language Programs (Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education)

Gardner R.C. and Lambert W.E., 1972
Attributes and Motivation in Second-Language Learning, Newbury House Publishers

Gardner R.C. and Smythe P.C., 1975
Motivation and Second Language Acquisition. The Canadian Modern Language Review, 218-230

Gardner R.C., Smythe P.C., Clément R. and Gliksman L., 1976
Second Language Learning: A Social Psychological Perspective. The Canadian Modern Language Review, Vol. 32, N° 3, 198-213

Genesee F., 1976a
The Suitability of Immersion Programs for all Children. The Canadian Modern Language Review, Vol. 32, N° 5, 494-515

Genesee F., 1976b
The Role of Intelligence in Second Language Learning. Language Learning, Vol. 26, N° 2, 267-280

Genesee F., 1979
Scholastic Effects of French Immersion: An Overview After Ten Years. Interchange, Vol. 9, N° 4, 20-29

Genesee F., Polich E. and Stanley M., 1977
An Experimental French Immersion Program at the Secondary School Level 1969 to 1974. The Canadian Modern Language Review, Vol. 33, N° 3, 318-332

Halpern G., 1976
Alternative School Programs for French Language Learning (Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education)

Hamayan E., Genesee F. and Tucker G.R., 1977
Affective Factors and Language Exposure in Second Language Learning. Language Learning, Vol. 27, N° 2, 225-241

Lambert W.E. and Tucker G.R., 1972
Bilingual Education of Children: The St. Lambert Experiment (Rowley, Mass: Newbury House Publishers)

Lapkin S. and Swain M., 1977
The Use of English and French Cloze Tests in a Bilingual Education Program Evaluation: Validity and Error Analysis. Language Learning, Vol. 27, N° 2

Lapkin S. and Swain M., 1979
The Immersion Centre and Dual-Track School: A Study of the Relationship Between School Environment and Achievement in a French Immersion Program. The Canadian Modern Language Review (in press)

Peal E. and Lambert W.E., 1962
The Relation of Bilingualism to Intelligence. Psychological Monographs, Vol. 76, 546

Pineo Peter C. and John Porter, Feb. 1967
Occupational Prestige in Canada, in The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, p. 34.

Stern H.H., Swain M., McLean L.D., and Friedman R.J., 1976
Three Approaches to Teaching French, (Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education)

Swain M., 1974
French Immersion Programs Across Canada: Research Findings, The Canadian Modern Language Review, Vol. 31, N° 2, 117-129

Swain M., 1976
Bibliography: Research on Immersion Education for the Majority Child, The Canadian Modern Language Review, Vol. 32, N° 5, 592-596

Swain M., 1978 a
French Immersion: Early, Late or Partial? The Canadian Modern Language Review, Vol. 34, 577-585

Swain, 1978 b
Bilingual Education for the English-Canadian. Paper presented at the Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics. (Toronto: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education) (mimeo)

Swain M., Lapkin S., Barik H.C., 1976
The Cloze Test as a Measure of Second Language Proficiency for Young Children, Working Papers on Bilingualism, N° 11

APPENDIX 1

RESEARCH AND EVALUATION OF FRENCH

IMMERSION PROGRAMS IN MANITOBA

STUDENT SCHOOL EXPERIENCE

GRADES 3, 6 AND 9

A) YEAR: 1979 - 1980

NAME OF STUDENT: _____

SCHOOL DIVISION: _____

SCHOOL : _____

GRADE : _____

BIRTHDAY : _____ _____ _____
day month year

B) YEAR: 1978 - 1979

GRADE OF STUDENT: _____

SCHOOL DIVISION: Same as A ☐ Other (specify) _____

SCHOOL : Same as A ☐ Other (specify) _____

PROGRAMME(S) IN THE SCHOOL (Check one)

English Programme only ☐

Français Programme only ☐

Both English and Français Programmes ☐

Immersion Programme only ☐

Both English and Immersion programmes ☐

Both Français and Immersion programmes ☐

PROGRAMME FOLLOWED BY STUDENT (Check one)

English		☐
Français total		☐
Français partiel		☐
Total Immersion:	Early	☐
	Late	☐
Partial Immersion	Early	☐
	Late	☐

Other: (describe) _____

_____

C) YEAR: 1977 - 1978

GRADE OF STUDENT: _____

SCHOOL DIVISION: Same as A ☐ Other (specify) _____

SCHOOL : Same as A ☐ Other (specify) _____

PROGRAMME(S) IN THE SCHOOL (Check one)

English Programme only	☐
Français Programme only	☐
Both English and Français Programmes	☐
Immersion Programme only	☐
Both English and Immersion programmes	☐
Both Français and Immersion programmes	☐

PROGRAMME FOLLOWED BY STUDENT (Check one)

English		☐
Français total		☐
Français partiel		☐
Total Immersion:	Early	☐
	Late	☐
Partial Immersion	Early	☐
	Late	☐

Other: (describe) _____

_____

D) YEAR: 1976 - 1977

GRADE OF STUDENT: _____

SCHOOL DIVISION: Same as A ☐ Other (specify) _____

SCHOOL : Same as A ☐ Other (specify) _____

PROGRAMME(S) IN THE SCHOOL (Check one)

English Programme only	☐
Français Programme only	☐
Both English and Français Programmes	☐
Immersion Programme only	☐
Both English and Immersion programmes	☐
Both Français and Immersion programmes	☐

PROGRAMME FOLLOWED BY STUDENT (Check one)

English		☐
Français total		☐
Français partiel		☐
Total Immersion:	Early	☐
	Late	☐
Partial Immersion	Early	☐
	Late	☐

Other: (describe) _____

_____

E) At what grade level was formal instruction in English language arts introduced?

_____

F) At what grade level, in the student's French Immersion programme, was reading in French introduced?

_____

_____

APPENDIX 2

SCORING SCALES: ORAL SAMPLES

A) Comprehension during conversation
- 5 - understands everything
- 4 - very few repetitions needed for comprehension
- 3 - several questions have to be repeated
- 2 - several questions have to be translated
- 1 - nearly all questions have to be translated

B) Pronunciation and fluency
- 5 - native-like pronunciation and fluency
- 4 - a few mispronounced words not affecting meaning
- 3 - inconsistent pronunciation leading to confusions
- 2 - serious pronunciation errors affecting communication
- 1 - pronunciation difficulties prevent communication
- 0 - sample too small for evaluation

C) Grammar and Syntax
- 5 - native-like knowledge of grammar and syntax
- 4 - a few grammatical and syntactic errors
- 3 - numerous grammatical and syntactic errors leading to ambiguous speech
- 2 - grammar and syntax insufficient leading to some incomprehensible speech
- 1 - grammar and syntax so limited that understanding is greatly affected
- 0 - sample too small to evaluate

D) Vocabulary
- 5 - vocabulary equivalent to a native speaker of the age group
- 4 - a few errors: sufficient vocabulary, rarely a borrowing or use of English words
- 3 - basic vocabulary but sufficient: some use of borrowing and English words
- 2 - very often the wrong word: many borrowings and English words
- 1 - insufficient vocabulary for production
- 0 - sample too small to evaluate

E) Communication
- 5 - willingness to communicate in French
- 4 - reticent but will communicate in French
- 3 - very little desire to communicate in French
- 2 - no desire to communicate in French
- 1 - refuses to speak in French

SCORING SCALES: WRITTEN SAMPLES

A) Spelling
- 5 - no errors
- 4 - a few errors
- 3 - many errors: comprehension is not affected
- 2 - many errors: comprehension is affected
- 1 - nearly all errors: incomprehensible
- 0 - sample too small to evaluate

B) Grammar and Syntax
- 5 - good grammar and syntax
- 4 - a few errors
- 3 - many errors: comprehension is not affected
- 2 - many errors: comprehension is affected
- 1 - many serious errors: nearly incomprehensible
- 0 - sample too small to evaluate

C) Vocabulary
- 5 - excellent vocabulary
- 4 - sufficient vocabulary: rarely a borrowing or English word
- 3 - limited but sufficient vocabulary: several borrowings and English words
- 2 - often the wrong word: many borrowings and English words
- 1 - insufficient vocabulary: production is affected
- 0 - sample too small to evaluate

D) Communication: conceptual level
- 5 - many ideas: text is structured and organized
- 4 - many ideas: text is uneven
- 3 - several ideas: repetitions and uneven text
- 2 - few ideas: uneven and disjointed text
- 1 - incomprehensible
- 0 - sample too small to evaluate

APPENDIX 3

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

GRADE 3

SCHOOL DIVISION: _____

SCHOOL: _____

GRADE: _____

CLASS: _____

NAME OF STUDENT: _____

SECTION A

Following are a number of sentences with which some people agree and others disagree. There are no right or wrong answers. Using the scale below, please describe how you feel:

A) strongly agree

B) agree

C) neither agree nor disagree

D) disagree

E) strongly disagree

Please remember, there are no right or wrong answers. Be as honest and as frank as possible in your answers. Put a circle around the letter which best describes how you feel.

SECTION A

[ ][ ]
1 - 2
[ ][ ]
3 - 4
[ ][ ]
5 - 6
[ ][ ]
7 - 8

1. My friends think it is worthwhile that I learn the French language.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 9
2. I feel that other students at school will make fun of me if I speak French outside the classroom.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 10
3. I think that the other students in my class can speak French better than I can.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 11
4. I feel that other students in my class will make fun of me when I speak French in the classroom.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 12
5. Studying French is important to me because I think it will someday be useful in getting a good job.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 13
6. I feel uncomfortable at school when I speak French outside the classroom.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 14
7. I want to learn French.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 15
8. To me, the French language is an important part of my school program.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 16
9. I feel uncomfortable when I have to speak in my French classes.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 17
10. My parents believe that I should study French as long as I stay in school.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 18
11. Studying French is important to me because it will help me understand and enjoy French books, magazines, records and television.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 19
12. Canadians who don't speak French should make an effort to learn the French language.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 20
13. I would rather spend more time on subjects other than French.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 21
14. Studying French is important to me because other people will think more of me if I know another language.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 22
15. French Canadians are very nice people.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 23

16. My parents feel it is important for me to know French.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 24
17. I feel that other people think I am a hard worker.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 25
18. My parents really encourage me to learn French.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 26
19. I often set goals for myself that are hard to achieve.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 27
20. Studying French is important to me because it will allow me to meet more people.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 28
21. My parents believe that I should spend <u>more</u> time studying French.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 29
22. Some of our best citizens are French Canadians.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 30
23. In my French classes, I feel uncomfortable if I have to answer a question in French.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 31
24. I enjoy learning French.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 32
25. I prefer to do difficult schoolwork.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 33
26. Other students in the school do not think much of the fact that I am learning the French language.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 34
27. It is a waste of time to learn the French language.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 35
28. My parents believe that French should be studied because we are living in Canada.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 36
29. Studying French is important to me because it helps me meet French people.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 37
30. Studying French is important to me because I'll need it for my career.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 38
31. I would like to know more French Canadians.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 39
32. Learning French helps me know English better.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 40
33. Studying French is important to me because it will help me make good friends with French-speaking Canadians.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 41

SECTION A

Please answer each of the following questions by putting a circle around the answer which describes what you do.

The scale is:

A) most of the time

B) often

C) sometimes

D) hardly ever

E) never

1. Do you watch French television?	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 42
2. Do you listen to the French radio station?	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 43
3. Do you speak French to your classmates in the classroom?	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 44
4. Do you speak French to your classmates outside the classroom?	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 45
5. Do you speak French to your classmates outside the school?	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 46
6. Do you speak French to other students in the school?	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 47
7. Do you speak French to your French teacher in the classroom?	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 48
8. Do you speak French to your French teacher outside the classroom?	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 49
9. Do you speak French to other teachers in the school?	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 50
10. Do you read French newspapers and magazines outside the classroom?	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 51
11. Do you speak French outside the school?	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 52
12. Do you read French language books that are not textbooks used in class?	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 53
13. Do you listen to French records outside the classroom?	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 54
14. Do your parents try to help you with your French?	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 55
15. Do your parents encourage you to practise your French?	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 56

SECTION C

1. If you could choose, would you continue in the French immersion program next year?

YES ___/ NO ___/ DON'T KNOW ___/ [ ] 57

Why? _____ [ ][ ] 58-59

_____ [ ][ ] 60-61

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

2. Do you participate in activities in which French is spoken besides those arranged by the school? (e.g. theatre, clubs, scouts, guides, sports, church, etc.)

YES ___/ NO ___/ [ ] 62

IF YES ! which ones _____ [ ][ ] 63-64

_____ [ ][ ] 65-66

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION

Dear student:

The purpose of this questionnaire is to better understand some of the reasons people have for studying a second language. Your answers to all questions will be treated in strictest confidence. Although we ask for your name on the cover page, we do so only because we must be able to associate your answers to this questionnaire with other information we will collect later. As soon as we receive your questionnaire, it will be numbered and then the first page will be removed.

For the result of the research to be meaningful, it is important that you be as accurate and as frank as possible in your answers. The usefulness of your questionnaire will be lessened to the extent that you do not answer each item.

We thank you for your cooperation and remind you that your answers are confidential.

The researchers

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

GRADE 6 AND 9

SCHOOL DIVISION: _____

SCHOOL: _____

GRADE: _____

CLASS: _____

NAME OF STUDENT: _____

SECTION A

Following are a number of statements with which some people agree and others disagree. There are no right or wrong answers. Using the scale below, please indicate your personal feelings:

A) strongly agree

B) agree

C) neither agree nor disagree

D) disagree

E) strongly disagree

Please remember, there are no right or wrong answers. Be as accurate and as frank as possible in your answers. Put a circle around the letter which best describes how you feel.

SECTION A

[ ][ ]
1 - 2
[ ][ ]
3 - 4
[ ][ ]
5 - 6
[ ][ ]
7 - 8

1. My friends think it is worthwhile that I learn the French language.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 9
2. I feel that other students at school will make fun of me if I speak French outside the classroom.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 10
3. I think that the other students in my class can speak French better than I can.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 11
4. French Canadians add a positive quality to the Canadian culture.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 12
5. When doing my schoolwork, I seldom do more than I am asked to do at school.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 13
6. The more I know about French Canadians, the more I want to be fluent in their language.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 14
7. I feel that other students in my class will make fun of me when I speak French in the classroom.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 15
8. Studying French is important to me because I think it will someday be useful in getting a good job.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 16
9. I feel uncomfortable at school when I speak French outside the classroom.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 17
10. I want to learn French.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 18
11. To me, the French language is an important part of my school program.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 19
12. I feel uncomfortable when I have to speak French in my French classes.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 20
13. My parents believe that I should study French as long as I stay in school.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 21
14. Studying French is important to me because it will help me understand and enjoy French books, magazines, records and television.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 22

15. Canadians who don't speak French should make an effort to learn the French language.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 23
16. I try to do my best even when others don't see what I do.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 24
17. I would rather spend more time on subjects other than French.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 25
18. Studying French is important to me because other people will think more of me if I know another language.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 26
19. French Canadians are very nice people.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 27
20. My parents feel it is important for me to know French.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 28
21. I feel that other people think I am a hard worker.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 29
22. My parents show a great interest in my French program.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 30
23. My parents really encourage me to learn French.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 31
24. Studying French is important to me because it will make me a more knowledgeable person.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 32
25. I often set goals for myself that are hard to achieve.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 33
26. Canada is fortunate to have the French Canadians.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 34
27. Studying French is important to me because it will allow me to meet more people.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 35
28. My parents believe that I should spend <u>more</u> time studying French.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 36
29. Some of our best citizens are French Canadians.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 37
30. In my French classes, I feel uncomfortable if I have to answer a question in French.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 38
31. It would be a great loss if Canada were to lose the French culture.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 39
32. I enjoy learning French.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 40
33. Studying French is important to me because it will help me understand the problems that French people have in Canada.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 41

34. Studying French is important to me because I will be able to participate more fully in cultural activities.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 42
35. I prefer to do difficult schoolwork.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 43
36. Studying French is important to me because I would like to travel to a French-speaking area.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 44
37. The French Canadian heritage is an important part of Canada.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 45
38. Other students in the school do not think much of the fact that I am learning the French language.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 46
39. It is a waste of time to learn the French language.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 47
40. My parents believe that French should be studied because we are living in Canada.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 48
41. Studying French is important to me because it helps me meet French people.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 49
42. Studying French is important to me because I'll need it for my career.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 50
43. I would like to know more French Canadians.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 51
44. Studying French is important to me because it will allow me to be more comfortable with people who speak French.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 52
45. Learning French helps me know English better.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 53
46. Studying French is important to me because it will help me make good friends with French-speaking Canadians.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 54
47. Studying French is important to me because it will help me be successful in business.	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 55

SECTION B

Please answer each of the following questions by putting a circle around the answer which describes what you do.

The scale is:

A) most of the time

B) often

C) sometimes

D) hardly ever

E) never

1. Do you watch French television?	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 56
2. Do you listen to the French radio station?	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 57
3. Do you speak French to your classmates in the classroom?	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 58
4. Do you speak French to your classmates outside the classroom?	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 59
5. Do you speak French to your classmates outside the school?	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 60
6. Do you speak French to other students in the school?	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 61
7. Do you speak French to your French teacher in the classroom?	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 62
8. Do you speak French to your French teacher outside the classroom?	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 63
9. Do you speak French to other teachers in the school?	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 64
10. Do you read French newspapers and magazines outside the classroom?	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 65
11. Do you speak French outside the school?	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 66
12. Do you read French-language books that are not textbooks used in class?	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 67
13. Do you listen to French records outside the classroom?	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 68
14. Do your parents try to help you with your French?	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 69
15. Do your parents encourage you to practise your French?	A - B - C - D - E	[ ] 70

SECTION C

1. If you could choose, would you continue in the French immersion program next year?

YES ___/ NO ___/ DON'T KNOW ___/ [ ] 71

! ! Why? ! ! _____ [ ][ ] 72-73

_____ [ ][ ] 74-75

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

2. Do you participate in activities in which French is spoken besides those arranged by the school? (e.g. theatre, clubs, scouts, guides, sports, church, etc.)

YES ___/ NO ___/ [ ] 76

! ! ! IF YES ! ! which ones _____ [ ][ ] 77-78

_____ [ ][ ] 79-80

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

GRADE 3

A. PARENTAL ENCOURAGEMENT

Q. 10, 16, 18, 21, 28 — N = 5

B. NEED ACHIEVEMENT

Q. 17, 19, 25 — N = 3

C. ANXIETY DURING FRENCH CLASS

Q. 3, 4, 9, 23 — N = 4

D. INTEGRATIVE MOTIVATION

Q. 11, 20, 29, 33 — N = 4

E. INSTRUMENTAL MOTIVATION

Q. 5, 14, 30, 32 — N = 4

F. ATTITUDES

Q. 12, 15, 21, 31 — N = 4

G. ANXIETY IN SCHOOL SITUATION

Q. 1, 2, 6, 26 — N = 4

H. ATTITUDES REGARDING LEARNING FRENCH

Q. 7, 8, 13, 24, 27 — N = 5

(N) TOTAL 33

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

GRADES 6 AND 9

A. PARENTAL ENCOURAGEMENT

Q. 13, 20, 22, 28, 40 N = 5

B. NEED ACHIEVEMENT

Q. 5, 16, 21, 25, 35 N = 5

C. ANXIETY DURING FRENCH CLASS

Q. 3, 7, 12, 30 N = 4

D. INTEGRATIVE MOTIVATION

Q. 14, 27, 33, 34, 41, 44, 46 N = 7

E. INSTRUMENTAL MOTIVATION

Q. 8, 18, 24, 36, 42, 45, 47 N = 7

F. ATTITUDES

Q. 4, 6, 15, 19, 26, 29, 31, 37, 43 N = 9

G. ANXIETY IN SCHOOL SITUATION

Q. 1, 2, 9, 38 N = 4

H. ATTITUDES REGARDING LEARNING FRENCH

Q. 10, 11, 17, 32, 39 N = 5

(N) TOTAL 47

APPENDIX 4

CERECO INC. 1980

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

SECTION A - ALL TEACHERS

[ ][ ][ ][ ]
1 - 4

[ ][ ][ ][ ]
5 - 8

Teaching Experience

1. What teaching experience do you have? Please write the number of years in the appropriate box(es). Include the present year (1979-80). The categories are not mutually exclusive and may add up to more than the total number of years of experience.

	K-3	4-6	7-9	9-12	
Teaching in English in regular English programs					[ ][ ][ ][ ] 9 - 12
Teaching in English in French immersion programs					[ ][ ][ ][ ] 13 - 16
Teaching the Core French program					[ ][ ][ ][ ] 17 - 20
Teaching in French in French immersion programs					[ ][ ][ ][ ] 21 - 24
Teaching English in Français programs					[ ][ ][ ][ ] 25 - 28
Teaching in French in Français programs					[ ][ ][ ][ ] 29 - 32
Special role (e.g., librarian): _____					[ ][ ][ ][ ] 33 - 36

What is your total teaching experience? _____ years [ ][ ] 37-38

2. Describe your teaching assignement this year. Indicate the subjects taught, the grade levels, the number of students per class and evaluate their academic ability.

	Subject	Grade	N° of Students per class	Academic ability (Above average = 1) (Average = 2) (Below average = 3) (Heterogeneous = 4) (Not applicable = 5)	
Class I			[ ]	[ ]	[ ][ ][ ][ ][ ] 39 - 43
Class II			[ ]	[ ]	[ ][ ][ ][ ][ ] 44 - 48
Class III			[ ]	[ ]	[ ][ ][ ][ ][ ] 49 - 53
Class IV			[ ]	[ ]	[ ][ ][ ][ ][ ] 54 - 58
Class V			[ ]	[ ]	[ ][ ][ ][ ][ ] 59 - 63
Class VI			[ ]	[ ]	[ ][ ][ ][ ][ ] 64 - 68
Class VII			[ ]	[ ]	[ ][ ][ ][ ][ ] 69 - 73
Class VIII			[ ]	[ ]	[ ][ ][ ][ ][ ] 74 - 78

3. In your teacher training, did you take courses in the following areas and, if so, at what level?

		YES	NO	ELEMENTARY	SECONDARY	
For regular English program	English language arts	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ] 9
	French language arts	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ] 10
	Other subjects_____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ] 11
	_____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ] 12
	_____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ] 13
For Français program	English language arts	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ] 14
	French language arts	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ] 15
	Other subjects_____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ] 16
	_____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ] 17
	_____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ] 18
For French immersion program	English language arts	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ] 19
	French language arts	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ] 20
	Other subjects_____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ] 21
	_____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ] 22
	_____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ] 23

4. A) Since your teacher training, have you taken formal studies in the following areas, and if so at what level?

		YES	NO	ELEMENTARY	SECONDARY	
For regular English program	English language arts	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ] 24
	French language arts	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ] 25
	Other subjects_____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ] 26
	_____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ] 27
	_____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ] 28
For Français program	English language arts	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ] 29
	French language arts	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ] 30
	Other subjects_____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ] 31
	_____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ] 32
	_____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ] 33

		YES	NO	ELEMENTARY	SECONDARY	
For French immersion program	English language arts	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ] 34
	French language arts	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ] 35
	Other subjects_____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ] 36
	_____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ] 37
	_____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ] 38

4. B) Since your teacher training, have you followed professional development programs (workshops, conferences, in-services, etc.) in the following areas and if so at what level?

		YES	NO	ELEMENTARY	SECONDARY	
For regular English program	English language arts	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ] 39
	French language arts	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ] 40
	Other subjects_____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ] 41
	_____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ] 42
	_____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ] 43
For Français program	English language arts	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ] 44
	French language arts	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ] 45
	Other subjects_____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ] 46
	_____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ] 47
	_____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ] 48
For French immersion program	English language arts	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ] 49
	French language arts	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ] 50
	Other subjects_____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ] 51
	_____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ] 52
	_____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ] 53

5. During the last five years, have you had any experiences which you feel increased your French language competency (e.g. trips to a French-speaking area, participation in a French-language theatre production, etc.)

YES [ ] , NO [ ] [ ] 54

IF YES	please specify experience and duration:

_____ [ ][ ][ ][ ]
55 - 58

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

LANGUAGE BACKGROUND

6. What language was the usual medium of instruction during your education?

PRIMARY _____ [ ] 59

SECONDARY _____ [ ] 60

UNIVERSITY
(other than teacher training) _____ [ ] 61

TEACHER TRAINING _____ [ ] 62

7. How well can you speak

	ENGLISH	FRENCH	
Like a native speaker	[ ]	[ ]	[ ] 63
Quite well	[ ]	[ ]	[ ] 64
Can get by	[ ]	[ ]	[ ] 65
Only a little	[ ]	[ ]	[ ] 66
Not at all	[ ]	[ ]	[ ] 67

8. To what extent do you use French in your

	HOME	SOCIAL CONTACTS	PROFESSIONAL CONTACTS	
Always	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ] 68
Frequently	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ] 69
Occasionally	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ] 70
Seldom	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ] 71
Never	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ] 72

PROGRAM INFORMATION

9. Describe the setting in which you teach (e.g. open area, closed classroom, team teaching, etc.).

_____ [ ][ ] 9 - 10

_____

_____

What type of setting do you prefer?

_____ [ ][ ] 11-12

_____

_____

Explain why _____

_____ [ ][ ] 13-14

_____

_____

10. In which type of school do you teach?

- School with the French immersion program only [ ] [ ] 15
- School with both English and Immersion programs [ ]
- School with both Français and Immersion programs [ ]

11. Do you have a teacher aide, volunteer helper or some other classroom help?

YES [ ] NO [ ] [ ] 16

IF YES,	Status of person helping	Hrs per week	Language used English	Language used French	
	_____	_____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ][ ][ ][ ] 17 - 20
	_____	_____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ][ ][ ][ ] 21 - 24
	_____	_____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ][ ][ ][ ] 25 - 28

Are you satisfied with this arrangement? YES [ ] NO [ ] [ ] 29

Please comment _____ [ ][ ] 30-31

_____

12. What remedial help is available for pupils needing it? Please specify who (consultant, resource teacher, aide, principal, etc.) gives the help and in what language (if applicable).

	Status of person(s) helping	Language English	Language French	
Oral French	_____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ][ ] 31-33
French reading	_____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ][ ] 34-35
Oral English	_____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ][ ] 36-37
English reading	_____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ][ ] 38-39
Science	_____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ][ ] 40-41
Mathematics	_____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ][ ] 42-43
Guidance	_____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ][ ] 44-45
Other	_____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ][ ] 46-47

13. Is this help adequate to meet your pupils' needs? YES [ ] NO [ ] [ ] 48

Please comment _____ [ ][ ] 49-50

_____

14. If you must be absent from your class, who takes over your duties and what language(s) does he/she use? Does he/she use the same language(s) you would use?

	ENGLISH ONLY	FRENCH ONLY	BOTH FRENCH AND ENGLISH	SAME LANGUAGE(S) I WOULD USE YES	SAME LANGUAGE(S) I WOULD USE NO	
a substitute teacher	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ][ ] 51-52
another teacher	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ][ ] 53-54
the principal	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ][ ] 55-56
classes doubled up	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ][ ] 57-58
classes cancelled [ ]	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	[ ] 59

Are you satisfied with this arrangement? YES [ ] NO [ ] [ ] 60

Please comment _____ [ ][ ] 61-62

_____

15. Do you feel that you have suitable human resources to call on for help with particular teaching needs in your program?

YES [ ] NO [ ] [ ] 63

Please give examples of the people you have called on (other teachers, principal, school librarian, consultants, etc.) and indicate the purposes.

_____ [ ][ ][ ][ ] 64 - 67

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

16. Do you have adequate opportunities for in-service training in areas in which you want to develop further? YES [ ] NO [ ] [ ] 68

Please elaborate _____ [ ][ ] 69-70

_____

17. A) Please give your assessment of the curriculum guides available in the subject areas you teach. If not suitable, explain why (e.g. non-existent for age level, level of French proficiency, culturally, methodologically, etc.).

	Adequate & Suitable	Suitable but not enough	Not suitable	
Fr. lang. arts				[ ] 71
Eng. lang. arts				[ ] 72
Mathematics				[ ] 73
Science				[ ] 74
Social Studies				[ ] 75
Other ( )				[ ][ ] 76-77
Other ( )				[ ][ ] 78-79
Other ( )				[ ] 80

17. B) Please give your assessment of the textbooks available in the subject areas you teach. (Check more than one box if applicable.)

	Adequate & Suitable	Suitable but not enough	Not suitable	
Fr. lang. arts				[ ] 9
Eng. lang. arts				[ ] 10
Mathematics				[ ] 11
Science				[ ] 12
Social Studies				[ ] 13
Other ( )				[ ][ ] 14-15
Other ( )				[ ][ ] 16-17
Other ( )				[ ] 18

17. C) Please give your assessment of the back-up resources available in the subject areas you teach. (Check more than one box if applicable.)

	Adequate & Suitable	Suitable but not enough	Not suitable	
Films, film-strips, etc.				[ ] 19
records and tapes				[ ] 20
radio and TV broadcasts				[ ] 21
posters & other visual aids				[ ] 22
Cultural activities				[ ] 23
supplementary books				[ ] 24
Other ( )				[ ][ ] 25-26
Other ( )				[ ][ ] 27-28

18. Does the school library/resource centre provide enough material for your pupils' needs?

IN ENGLISH: YES [ ] NO [ ] | IN FRENCH: YES [ ] NO [ ] [ ][ ][ ] 29-31

IF NO, what is needed? | IF NO, what is needed? [ ][ ][ ] 32-34

USE OF FRENCH

19. How much of the material displayed (posters, pupils' work, etc.) is French or French-oriented?

in your classroom	___%	[ ][ ] 35-36
in the school corridors	___%	[ ][ ] 37-38
on parents' night in your class	___%	[ ][ ] 39-40
on parents' night or other such occasions in the whole school	___%	[ ][ ] 41-42

20. How much of the following is conducted in French?

school assemblies	___%	[ ][ ] 43-44
school activities (e.g. sports days, concerts, etc.)	___%	[ ][ ] 45-46
P.A. announcements	___%	[ ][ ] 47-48
conversation in the staff room(s)	___%	[ ][ ] 49-50
staff meetings	___%	[ ][ ] 51-52
other:_____	___%	[ ][ ][ ] 53-55

Please comment_____ [ ][ ] 56-57

_____

21. Do your pupils speak French

	not at all	some-times	of-ten	don't know	
to you in lessons taught in French	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	NA	[ ] 58
to you otherwise in the classroom	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]		[ ] 59
to you outside the classroom	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]		[ ] 60
to other teachers during lessons taught in French	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ] 61
to other pupils during lessons taught in French	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ] 62
to other pupils otherwise in the classroom	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ] 63
to their own classmates outside the classroom	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ] 64
to other pupils in the school	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ] 65
to other members of the school staff	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ] 66

Do you think your pupils ought to use more French in the school? YES [ ] NO [ ] [ ] 67

22. How much do you think your pupils generally take advantage of French activities (movies, magazines, TV, etc.) outside the school?

A LOT [ ] A LITTLE [ ] NOT AT ALL [ ] DON'T KNOW [ ] [ ] 68

GOALS OF THE FRENCH IMMERSION PROGRAM

23. In your opinion, why have parents of immersion pupils chosen that program? (Check more than one if applicable.)

To enable the child to get a better job as an adult	[ ]	[ ] 9
To help the child to get along with French Canadians	[ ]	[ ] 10
For travel purposes	[ ]	[ ] 11
For the value inherent in learning a second language	[ ]	[ ] 12
To get special attention for the child at school	[ ]	[ ] 13
To give the child contact with a second culture	[ ]	[ ] 14
To provide an additional scholastic challenge	[ ]	[ ] 15
Other_____	[ ]	[ ][ ] 16-17
Other_____	[ ]	[ ][ ] 18-19
Other_____	[ ]	[ ][ ] 20-21

Do you think parents are generally satisfied with the immersion program?

YES [ ] NO [ ] [ ] 22

Please comment_____ [ ][ ] 23-24

_____

24. How would you rate the participation of parents in home and school, and other school functions?

ABOVE AVERAGE [ ] AVERAGE [ ] BELOW AVERAGE [ ] [ ] 25

What kind of concerns have parents expressed to you about the immersion program? (Please check more than one if applicable.)

[ ] too much French in the program [ ] 26

[ ] too much English in the program [ ] 27

[ ] the materials aren't good enough [ ] 28

[ ] extra support facilities (remedial, etc.) not good enough [ ] 29

[ ] scheduling problems [ ] 30

[ ] transportation problems [ ] 31

[ ] can't help children with their homework [ ] 32

[ ] children aren't achieving enough in regular subjects [ ] 33

[ ] children aren't learning enough French [ ] 34

[ ] inadequate physical facilities [ ] 35

[ ] other_____ [ ][ ] 36-37

[ ] other_____ [ ][ ] 38-39

25. If you could choose freely which type of program to teach next year, what would you choose?

I would choose to teach [ ] in English [ ] 40

[ ] in French

I would choose to teach in [ ] a regular English program [ ][ ] 41-42

[ ] a core French program

[ ] an early total French immersion program

[ ] an early partial French immers. program

[ ] a late total French immersion program

[ ] a late partial French immersion program

[ ] a Français school

[ ] no preference

[ ] other_____

If your choice is immersion, which of the following would you prefer?

[ ] An English school with an immersion centre [ ] 43

[ ] An immersion school

[ ] A French school with an immersion centre

SECTION B

TO BE COMPLETED BY THE HOMEROOM TEACHER

1. Has your class mainly been together as a unit since the children entered school [ ]

   or

   has the composition of the class generally changed from year to year? [ ] [ ] 44

   Please comment_____ [ ][ ] 45-46

   _____

2. Approximately what percentage of your pupils' time is spent on

   French language arts _____% [ ][ ] 47-48

   Other subjects taught in French _____% [ ][ ] 49-50

   English language arts _____% [ ][ ] 51-52

   Other subjects taught in English _____% [ ][ ] 53-54

   Are you satisfied with this proportion? YES [ ] NO [ ] [ ] 55

   Please comment_____ [ ][ ] 56-57

   _____

3. Who teaches the various subjects in your class and in what language?

	myself	another classroom teacher	special teacher	Language of instruction: English	Language of instruction: French	
French language arts				NA	NA	[ ] 58
English language arts				NA	NA	[ ] 59
Mathematics						[ ][ ] 60-61
Social studies						[ ][ ] 62-63
Science						[ ][ ] 64-65
Music						[ ][ ] 66-67
Art						[ ][ ] 68-69
Phys. ed.						[ ][ ] 70-71
Other_____						[ ][ ] 72-73
Other_____						[ ][ ] 74-75
Other_____						[ ][ ] 76-77

Are you satisfied with this arrangement? YES [ ] NO [ ] [ ] 78

Please comment [ ][ ] 79-80

If there are any other comments you wish to make on French immersion programs, please use the space below to do so.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION

TO BE COMPLETED BY ALL FRENCH LANGUAGE ARTS TEACHERS

N.B. Please complete a separate questionnaire for each class you teach

SCHOOL DIVISION: _____ [ ][ ] 1 - 2

SCHOOL: _____ [ ][ ] 3 - 4

CLASS: _____ [ ][ ] 5 - 6

GRADE: _____ [ ][ ] 7 - 8

1. To develop your students' proficiency in French, do you rely more on formal teaching of French grammar and vocabulary [ ] or on their daily contact with French in their reading and other subject studies? [ ] [ ] 9

   Please comment _____ [ ][ ] 10-11

   _____

2. Describe the objectives you have had for your students in French language development during the present year.

   _____ [ ][ ][ ][ ] 12 - 15

   _____

   _____ [ ][ ][ ][ ] 16 - 19

   _____ [ ][ ][ ][ ] 20 - 23

   _____

   _____

   _____

3. List the special activities which you have had with your class in the French language or culture during the present year.

   _____ [ ][ ][ ][ ] 24 - 27

   _____

   _____ [ ][ ][ ][ ] 28 - 31

   _____ [ ][ ][ ][ ] 32 - 35

   _____

   _____

   _____

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION

[ ][ ] 1-2

[ ][ ] 3-4

PRINCIPAL'S QUESTIONNAIRE

1. How many years of administrative experience have you had in schools with:

	YEARS	
An English program only	____	[ ][ ] 5-6
A Français program only	____	[ ][ ] 7-8
Both English and Français programs	____	[ ][ ] 9-10
A French Immersion program only	____	[ ][ ] 11-12
Both English and French immersion programs	____	[ ][ ] 13-14
Both Français and French immersion programs	____	[ ][ ] 15-16
Total administrative experience	____	[ ][ ] 17-18

2. Have you taught any of the following? If yes, please indicate how many years.

	YES	NO	YEARS	
French as a second language	[ ]	[ ]	____	[ ][ ] 19-20
English as a second language	[ ]	[ ]	____	[ ][ ] 21-22
any other language as a second language	[ ]	[ ]	____	[ ][ ] 23-24

3. What language was the usual medium of instruction during your education?

PRIMARY	_____	[ ] 25
SECONDARY	_____	[ ] 26
UNIVERSITY (Other than teacher training)	_____	[ ] 27
TEACHER TRAINING	_____	[ ] 28

4. How well can you speak

	ENGLISH	FRENCH	
Like a native speaker	[ ]	[ ]	[ ][ ] 29-30
Quite well	[ ]	[ ]	
Can get by	[ ]	[ ]	
Only a little	[ ]	[ ]	
Not at all	[ ]	[ ]	

5. To what extent do you use French in your

	HOME	SOCIAL CONTACTS	PROFESSIONAL CONTACTS	CONTACTS WITH FRENCH IMMERSION STUDENTS	
Always	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ][ ] 31-32
Frequently	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ][ ] 33-34
Occasionally	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	
Seldom	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	
Never	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	

6. Describe your school in terms of

Number of classes _____ [ ][ ] 35-36

Number of grades _____ [ ][ ] 37-38

Total number of students _____ [ ][ ] 39-40

7. For each grade, how many classes are French immersion and how many pupils are there in each?

Grade	K	1	1-2	2	2-3	3	3-4	4	4-5	5	5-6	6	7	8	9	10	11	
																		[ ][ ][ ][ ][ ]
																		[ ][ ][ ][ ][ ]
N° of																		[ ][ ][ ][ ][ ]
classes																		[ ][ ] 41-57
																		[ ][ ][ ][ ][ ]
N° of																		[ ][ ][ ][ ][ ]
pupils																		[ ][ ][ ][ ][ ]
																		[ ][ ][ ][ ][ ]
																		[ ][ ][ ][ ][ ]
																		[ ][ ][ ][ ][ ]
																		[ ][ ][ ][ ][ ]

8. Are French immersion classes: [ ][ ][ ][ ] 35-38

a) the only classes in the school [ ] [ ] 39

b) all located in one section of the school [ ]

c) distributed with other regular program classes [ ]

Please comment on any special arrangements _____ [ ][ ] 40-41

_____

Do you think that the arrangements that now exist are satisfactory?

YES [ ] NO [ ] [ ] 42

Please comment _____ [ ][ ] 43-44

_____

9. Please describe how French immersion pupils are grouped into classes in your school (late immersion combined with early immersion, on the basis of school achievement, of standardized testing, social maturity, randomly; only one class.)

_____ [ ][ ] 45-46

_____ [ ][ ] 47-48

_____

_____

_____

10. What is the staff count in your school and what is the staff count allocated to the French immersion program?

Staff	Whole school	Immersion	
Principals, V.P.			[ ][ ] 49-50
Regular classroom Teachers			[ ][ ][ ][ ] 51 - 54
Clerical staff			[ ][ ] 55-56
Specialist Teachers			[ ][ ][ ][ ] 57 - 60
Other			[ ][ ] 61-62

Is the allocation of staff between French immersion and other programs suitable?

YES [ ] NO [ ] [ ] 63

Please comment_____ [ ][ ] 64-65

_____

11. What consultative personnel is available to French immersion teachers and in what language is this help available? (Check as many as are applicable.)

	FRENCH	ENGLISH	
Other teachers			[ ][ ][ ][ ] 66 - 69
Principal and V.P.			[ ][ ] 70-71
School librarian			[ ][ ] 72-73
Resource teacher			[ ][ ] 74-75
Immersion consultant			[ ][ ] 76-77
Other consultants (specify)			[ ][ ] 78-79

Do you think that the above arrangement is satisfactory?

YES [ ] NO [ ] [ ] 5

Please comment _____ [ ][ ] 6-7

_____

Are these resources generally comparable to those available to teachers in the regular English program?

[ ] more for Immersion [ ] same [ ] less for Immersion [ ] 8

12. What personnel is available for remedial help for French immersion pupils who need it and in what language(s) is the help available? (Check as many as are applicable)

	FRENCH	ENGLISH	
Other teachers			[ ][ ] 9-10
Principal and V.P.			[ ][ ] 11-12
Resource teachers			[ ][ ] 13-14
Subject area specialists, French reading			[ ][ ] 15-16
English reading			[ ][ ] 17-18
Math.			[ ][ ] 19-20
Other			[ ][ ] 21-22
Other			[ ][ ] 23-24

Do you think the above arrangement is satisfactory?

YES [ ] NO [ ] [ ] 25

Please comment _____ [ ][ ] 26-27

_____

Are these resources generally comparable to those available to pupils in regular English programs?

[ ] more for Immersion [ ] same [ ] less for Immersion [ ] 28

13. How many teacher aides or volunteer helpers are there working with immersion classes? What language do they use? (Use fractions if necessary to show how a person's time is divided among classes.)

Grade	K	1	1-2	2	2-3	3	3-4	4	4-5	5	5-6	6	7	8	9	10	11
N° of persons																	
Languages used (E.,F.)																	

[ ][ ][ ][ ][ ]
[ ][ ][ ][ ][ ]
[ ][ ][ ][ ][ ]
[ ][ ] 29-45
[ ][ ][ ][ ][ ]
[ ][ ][ ][ ][ ]
[ ][ ][ ][ ][ ]
[ ][ ][ ][ ][ ]
[ ][ ][ ][ ][ ]
[ ][ ][ ][ ][ ]
[ ][ ][ ][ ] 46-79

Do you think the above arrangement is satisfactory?

YES [ ] NO [ ] [ ] 5

Please comment_____ [ ][ ] 6-7

_____

Is this arrangement comparable to assistance provided for regular English program classes?

[ ] greater for Immersion [ ] same as for English program [ ] 8

[ ] less for Immersion

13. Does the school library/resource centre provide facilities for Franch immersion pupils comparable to those available to regular English program students?

[ ] more for Immersion [ ] same as for English program [ ] 9

[ ] less for Immersion

Do you think that the facilities for French immersion are satisfactory?

YES [ ] NO [ ] [ ] 10

Please comment_____ [ ][ ] 11-12

_____

15. What percentage of the material displayed (posters, pupils' work, etc.) in the school is French or French-oriented?

in immersion classrooms _____% [ ][ ] 13-14

in the corridors _____% [ ][ ] 15-16

for special occasions (e.g. parents' night) 320 [ ][ ] 17-18

16. How much of the following is conducted in French:

school assemblies	_____%	[ ][ ] 19-20
school activities like sports days	_____%	[ ][ ] 21-22
P.A. announcements	_____%	[ ][ ] 23-24
pupils' interactions with teachers other than their own	_____%	[ ][ ] 25-26
pupils' interactions in the office	_____%	[ ][ ] 27-28
conversation in the staffroom	_____%	[ ][ ] 29-30
teachers' meetings	_____%	[ ][ ] 31-32

These percentages are:

too great [ ] satisfactory [ ] not enough [ ] [ ] 33

Please comment_____ [ ][ ] 34-35

_____

17. If you could choose freely which type of program to administer next year, which would you choose?

[ ] regular English [ ] early immersion [ ] late immersion [ ] 36

[ ] Francophone school [ ] no preference

[ ] other _____

If French immersion, would you rather be

a) In a school with an immersion centre [ ] [ ] 37

b) In an immersion school? [ ]

18. In your opinion, why have parents of immersion pupils chosen that program? (If you select more than one reason, please rank order your selection by putting a number in the box).

[ ] To enable the child to get a better job as an adult [ ][ ][ ]
[ ] To help the child to get along with Francophones 38 - 41
[ ] For travel purposes
[ ] For the value inherent in learning a second language [ ][ ][ ]
[ ] To get special attention for the child at school 42 - 45
[ ] To give the child contact with a second culture
[ ] To provide an additional scholastic challenge
[ ] Other_____
[ ] Other_____
[ ] Other_____

19. Do you think parents are generally satisfied with the French Immersion program in your school?

YES [ ] NO [ ] [ ] 46

Please comment_____ [ ][ ] 47-48

_____

Do you think that the French immersion program will live up to the parents' long-term expectations (i.e. when the child has finished school)?

YES [ ] NO [ ] [ ] 49

Please comment_____ [ ][ ] 50-51

_____

20. Is the French immersion program generally fulfilling the goals you have for it year by year in your school (i.e. in the short term)?

YES [ ] NO [ ] [ ] 52

Please comment_____ [ ][ ] 53-54

_____

In terms of the pupils' entire schooling, do you think the French immersion program will meet its goals?

YES [ ] NO [ ] [ ] 55

Please comment_____ [ ][ ] 56-57

_____

21. Please check the statement(s) appropriate to your school.

The school encourages immersion pupils to leave the program

[ ] if they are not achieving well in general [ ] 58

[ ] if they are not achieving well in second language learning

[ ] if they have behaviour problems

[ ] if they have learning disabilities

[ ] if _____

[ ] The school does not encourage French immersion pupils to leave the program

Please comment_____ [ ][ ] 59-60

_____

22. Do children have to leave your school if they transfer out of the French immersion program?

YES [ ] NO [ ] [ ] 61

IF YES, to what extent does this fact influence decisions to keep children in the French Immersion program who might otherwise transfer out of it?

[ ] a major factor [ ] not very important [ ] not at all [ ] 62

Please comment_____ [ ][ ] 63-64

_____

23. If pupils from the French immersion program are transferred into the regular, non-immersion program, do they generally (Check one only)

[ ] adjust fairly quickly [ ] 65

[ ] have to struggle to adjust over a considerable period of time

[ ] have such adjustment problems that the transfer out of French immersion does not seem justified

[ ] react differently to the transfer from child to child

[ ] other_____

[ ] don't know

24. Do you think that the administrative work associated with the French immersion program is

[ ] too much in relation to the value of the program [ ] 66

[ ] justified by the value of the program

[ ] more than compensated for by the value of the program

[ ] same as a regular English program

25. Do any of the following administrative areas associated with the French immersion program create more difficulty for you than would be the case for a non-immersion program? (Please check as many as are applicable.)

[ ] Scheduling and timetabling [ ][ ] 67-68

[ ] Getting basic programs (curriculums) established [ ][ ] 69-70

[ ] Getting resource materials

[ ] Hiring staff [ ][ ] 71-72

[ ] Staff relations [ ][ ] 73-74

[ ] Public relations (e.g. visitors, testing, publicity) [ ][ ] 75-76

[ ] Parents' demands

[ ] Bussing and other transportation [ ][ ] 77-78

[ ] Crowding in the school [ ][ ] 79-80

[ ] Professional development of teachers

[ ] Finding substitute teachers [ ][ ] 5-6

[ ] Absence of regular staff (for meetings, special extracurricular activities)

[ ] Discipline problems

[ ] Pupil transfers

[ ] Staff transfers

[ ] Organizing remedial programs

[ ] Nature of physical facilities

[ ] Other _____

[ ] Other _____

26. Does the nature of the school divisions' transportation policy influence parents' decisions to send their children to a French immersion program?

YES [ ] NO [ ] NO OPINION [ ] [ ] 7

Please comment_____ [ ][ ][ ][ ]

_____ 8 - 11

_____

_____ [ ][ ][ ][ ]

_____ 12 - 15

_____

_____

27. What are the objectives of the immersion program in your school?

_____ [ ][ ][ ][ ]

_____ 16 -19

_____

_____ [ ][ ][ ][ ]

_____ 20 - 23

_____

N.B. If the previous objectives are available in a separate document, please forward it with the questionnaire.

If there are any other comments you wish to make on French immersion programs, please use the space below to do so.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION

APPENDIX 5

CERECO INC., 1980

RESEARCH AND EVALUATION OF FRENCH IMMERSION PROGRAMS IN MANITOBA

PARENTS' QUESTIONNAIRE

1. NAME OF CHILD _____ [ ][ ] 1-2

   SCHOOL CHILD IS ATTENDING _____ [ ][ ] 3-4

   BIRTH DATE OF CHILD _____ ! _____ ! _____ [ ][ ][ ]
   day month year [ ][ ][ ]
   5 - 10

   SEX OF CHILD M [ ] F [ ] [ ] 11

   GRADE OF CHILD (3, 6 or 9) 3 [ ] 6 [ ] 9 [ ] [ ] 12

2. Other children in family attending school

AGE	SEX	GRADE	FRENCH IMMERSION YES	FRENCH IMMERSION NO	
_____	_____	_____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ][ ][ ][ ][ ] 13 - 17
_____	_____	_____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ][ ][ ][ ][ ] 18 - 22
_____	_____	_____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ][ ][ ][ ][ ] 23 - 27

3. Languages spoken at home

	ENGLISH	FRENCH	OTHER (SPECIFY)	DOESN'T APPLY	
By child	[ ]	[ ]	_____	[ ]	[ ] 28
By mother	[ ]	[ ]	_____	[ ]	[ ] 29
By father	[ ]	[ ]	_____	[ ]	[ ] 30
By brothers and sisters	[ ]	[ ]	_____	[ ]	[ ] 31

4. First language spoken and still understood

   by father _____ [ ] 32

   by mother _____ [ ] 33

5. Father's ability to speak French

a) speaks fluently [ ] [ ] 34

b) can carry on a conversation [ ]

c) can understand but not speak it [ ]

d) doesn't know any French [ ]

6. Mother's ability to speak French

a) speaks fluently [ ] [ ] 35

b) can carry on a conversation [ ]

c) can understand but not speak it [ ]

d) doesn't know any French [ ]

7. Father's highest level of education

a) some high school or less [ ] [ ] 36

b) completed high school [ ]

c) community college/technical school [ ]

d) some university [ ]

e) bachelor's degree (e.g., B.A., B.Sc., etc.) [ ]

f) post-graduate degree (e.g., M.A., Ph. D. doctor, dentist, etc.) [ ]

g) other (specify) _____ [ ]
(e.g. nurse's training at hospital, private business school, etc.)

8. Mother's highest level of education

a) some high school or less	[ ]	[ ] 37
b) completed high school	[ ]	
c) community college/technical school	[ ]	
d) some university	[ ]	
e) bachelor's degree (e.g., B.A., B.Sc., etc.)	[ ]	
f) post-graduate degree (e.g., M.A., Ph. D. doctor, dentist, etc.)	[ ]	
g) other (specify) _____ (e.g. nurse's training at hospital, private business school, etc.)	[ ]	

9. Total family income before taxes and other deductions

$ 9,999 or less	[ ]	[ ] 38
10,000 to 19,999	[ ]	
20,000 to 29,999	[ ]	
30,000 to 39,999	[ ]	
40,000 or more	[ ]	

10. Father's occupation (specify) _____ [ ][ ] 39-40
(at least two words)

11. Mother's occupation (specify) _____ [ ][ ] 41-42
(at least two words)

12. Following are a number of statements with which some people agree and others disagree. There are no right or wrong answers but only different opinions. Please rate how much you (as parents) personally agree or disagree with these statements using the scale below.

1 - strongly agree

2 - moderately agree

3 - indifferent

4 - moderately disagree

5 - strongly disagree

Please indicate your personal opinion in the left-hand margin by writing the number which corresponds to your agreement or disagreement.

_____ a) Studying French is important for my (our) child because it will help him (her) should he (she) travel to a French-speaking area. [ ] 43

_____ b) All Canadians who do not speak French should make an effort to learn the French language. [ ] 44

_____ c) Studying French is important for my (our) child because it would make it easier for him (her) to associate with French Canadians. [ ] 45

_____ d) Studying French is important for my (our) child because it will improve his (her) employment opportunities. [ ] 46

_____ e) It would be a great loss if Canada should lose the French culture. [ ] 47

_____ f) Studying French is important for my (our) child because other people will respect him (her) more if he (she) has a knowledge of another language. [ ] 48

_____ g) The school my (our) child attends provides a more satisfactory setting than other types of French immersion settings. [ ] 49

_____ h) Studying French is important for my (our) child because it will enable him (her) to better understand French Canadians. [ ] 50

_____ i) The best immersion setting is one in which only the French immersion program exists in the school. [ ] 51

_____ j) Learning French does not make my (our) child question his (her) belonging to his (her) culture. [ ] 52

_____ k) Studying French is important for my (our) child because it will help him (her) appreciate the problems that French people have in Canada. [ ] 53

_____ l) Studying French is important because it will help my (our) child understand his (her) own language better. [ ] 54

_____ m) Studying French is important for my (our) child because Canada is a bilingual country. [ ] 55

_____ n) The French Canadian heritage is an important part of our Canadian identity. [ ] 56

_____ o) Studying French offers my (our) child an educational challenge that is not available to him (her) in other public school programs. [ ] 57

Please answer each of the following questions with a check mark (✓) next to the answer which is the most applicable to you. We would like to remind you that no teacher will have access to the questionnaire, and that all information is strictly confidential.

13. Are you satisfied with the French immersion program in which your child is enrolled?. [ ] 58

a) very satisfied [ ]

b) moderately satisfied [ ]

c) neither satisfied, nor dissatisfied [ ]

d) moderately dissatisfied [ ]

e) very dissatisfied [ ]

14. Do you want your child to continue in French immersion?

YES [ ] NO [ ] [ ] 59

15. If yes, for how long do you want your child to continue?

a) to the end of elementary (grade 6) [ ] [ ] 60

b) to the end of junior high (grade 9) [ ]

c) to the end of high school (grade 12) [ ]

d) to have the possibility of pursuing university studies in French [ ]

16. Does your child watch programs in the French language...

a) most of the time [ ] [ ] 61

b) often [ ]

c) sometimes [ ]

d) hardly ever [ ]

e) never [ ]

17. Does your child listen to the French radio station...

a) most of the time [ ] [ ] 62

b) often [ ]

c) sometimes [ ]

d) hardly ever [ ]

e) never [ ]

18. Does your child read French newspapers and magazines outside the classroom...

a) most of the time [ ] [ ] 63

b) often [ ]

c) sometimes [ ]

d) hardly ever [ ]

e) never [ ]

19. Does your child have the opportunity to speak French outside the school...

a) most of the time [ ] [ ] 64

b) often [ ]

c) sometimes [ ]

d) hardly ever [ ]

e) never [ ]

20. Does your child read French language books that are not textbooks used in class...

a) most of the time [ ] [ ] 65

b) often [ ]

c) sometimes [ ]

d) hardly ever [ ]

e) never [ ]

21. Do you attend school meetings or other activities organized by the school...

	FATHER	MOTHER	
a) most of the time	[ ]	[ ]	[ ][ ] 66-67
b) often	[ ]	[ ]	
c) sometimes	[ ]	[ ]	
d) hardly ever	[ ]	[ ]	
e) never	[ ]	[ ]	

22. What mode of transportation does your child use to get to school?

a) walk [ ] [ ] 68

b) school bus [ ]

c) public transit [ ]

d) automobile [ ]

e) other (specify) [ ] _____

23. Are you satisfied with the mode of transportation your child uses?

YES [ ] NO [ ] [ ] 69

Please comment _____ [ ][ ] 70-71

_____

24. To what extent do transportation arrangements affect your decision to enroll your child in a French immersion program? (i.e. indicate the type of arrangements that would not allow your child to continue in the program).

_____ [ ][ ] 72-73

_____

_____

_____

25. Is it important to you that your child participate in activities where he (she) is exposed to the French language?

YES [ ] NO [ ] [ ] 74

Please comment_____ [ ][ ] 75-76

_____

26. Has your child participated in any activities in French outside the school during the last three years (e.g. visit to French-speaking area, summer camp in French, student exchange, theatre, etc.)

NO [ ] [ ] 77

YES [ ] Please specify the kind of experience, its duration and how you would evaluate the activities.

_____ [ ][ ][ ]
[ ][ ][ ]
13 - 18

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

27. In what area would you like to see more activities in French for your child?

a) outside the school _____ [ ][ ][ ]
[ ][ ][ ]
19 - 24

_____

_____

_____

_____

b) in the school _____ [ ][ ][ ]
[ ][ ][ ]
25 - 30

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

28. Parents have varied reasons for enrolling their child in a French immersion program. Would you please indicate the reasons which are important to you?

_____ [ ][ ][ ][ ]
[ ][ ][ ][ ]
31 - 38

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

29. Have you any additional comments concerning your child studying French or the French immersion program?

_____ [ ][ ][ ][ ]
39 - 42

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION

SUMMARY OF TRANSPORTATION POLICIES OF PARTICIPATING SCHOOL DIVISIONS

The summary includes only those parts of school divisions' policies which are applicable to the existing French immersion programmes within the school division (1979-1980).

School divisions:

Winnipeg #1

1. The school division provides free transportation by school bus for students from kindergarten to the end of grade 2 who live more than ¾ of a mile from their school.

2. From grade 3 to grade 11, if immersion students need transportation, it is at the parents' expense.

Saint-Boniface #4

1. The school division provides free transportation by school bus for students from kindergarten to grade 8 who live one mile or more from their school.

Saint-Vital #6

1. The school division provides free transportation by school bus for students from kindergarten to grade 4 who live more than 1.5 km from their school.

2. The school division provides two City transit tickets (or the cash value of the tickets) per day for students in grades 5 to 9 who live more than 1.6 km from their school.

Transcona-Springfield #12

1. The school division provides two transit bus tickets per day to students in kindergarten to grade 2 who live more than ½ a mile from the school and to students from grades 3 to 8 who live more than one mile from the school.

Rivière Seine #14

1. Kindergarten students are entitled to free transportation regardless of the distance they live from their school. The school division provides school bus transportation for students in grades 1 to 6 who live more than ½ a mile from their school. From grades 7 to 12, students who live further than one mile in a built-up area or ¾ of a mile in a rural area, are provided with transportation.

Rivière Rouge #17

1. The school division provides transportation or payment in lieu of transportation, to and from school in accordance with the Public Schools Act of Manitoba, that is, to all students who live more than one mile from their school.

White Horse Plains #20

1. The school division provides transportation or payment in lieu of transportation, to and from school in accordance with the Public Schools Act of Manitoba, that is, to all students who live more than one mile from their school.

APPENDIX 6

OCCUPATION IN THE CALCULATION OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS

All answers to the questions were classified using Statistics Canada's categories:

1) Administrator
2) Liberal profession and technicians
3) Office worker
4) Recreational activities and services personnel and transportation and communication personnel
5) Farmer and agriculturally related jobs
6) Lumberjack and forestry personnel, fisherman, hunter and trapper, miner, quarryman and those with similar occupations
7) Production worker and those with similar occupations
8) Salesperson
11) Laborer

To these we have added:

0) Does not apply (father/mother deceased or couple separated)
9) No answer
10) Housewife
12) Retired
13) Unemployed
14) Student
15) Others (not specified)
16) Undecided
17) Self-employed
18) Athlete
19) Artist

We then tried to define each of these categories using as reference two socio-economic indices; those of Porter and Pineo and those of Blischen(1). The first, that of Porter and Pineo, is a subjective index calculated with a Canadian population sample on the "social position" of 204 Canadian occupations. The second, elaborated by Blischen on the 1951 census and revised with the statistics of 1961, is an unbiased stratification of occupations based on the employee's education and revenue. It is more unbiased for the simple reason that prestige does not come into play. It must be noted however that, even in an unbiased stratification, revenue will reflect, up to a certain point, the occupation's prestige. On the other hand, note that prestige can be attributed to the revenue of the occupation. Therefore the first index (we could call it an index of social status) and the second (an index of economic status) measure very nearly the same thing. In fact, the correlation between the indices of Porter - Pineo and Blischen, for 88 comparable occupations, is .912 (2), a very strong correlation. Using the index of Pineo and Porter (3) as a guide, we assigned values to the Statistics Canada classifications which we had used in our coding (i.e., the occupations with codes 1 to 8 inclusive and 11). This had already been done by Pineo and Porter and can be found in Table A - 1A. However, we did have to recalculate the values for the occupations carrying codes 4 and 6. The occupations of code 4 had been divided in two by Porter and Pineo, that is:

- recreational activities and service workers
- those employed in transportation and communication

Similarly, the 6th category had been divided in three:

- lumberjack and forestry personnel
- fisherman, hunter and trapper
- miner, quarryman and those with similar occupations

---

(1) The two methods of calculating the socio-economic index are presented in The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, Vol. 4, N° 1, Feb. 1967.

(2) Bernard R. Blischen, A Socio-Economic Index for Occupation in Canada, in The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, Vol. 4, N° 1, Feb. 1967, p. 50.

(3) Peter C. Pineo and John Porter, Occupational Prestige in Canada, in The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, Feb. 1967, p. 34.

These scores were subsequently transformed in the range of 1 to 10, with the highest score having the lowest ranking.

Using the same method, we arranged the other answers to the occupation question which were not included in the Statistics Canada categories. Codes 9 (no answer), 12 (retired), 15 (other, not specified) and 16 (undecided) have as rank the average of all occupations. We arranged the occupations with codes 0 (not applicable), 10 (housewife), 13 (unemployed), 14 (student), 17 (self employed), 18 (athlete) and 19 (artist). First, for the category of code 0, where the parents were deceased or the couple had separated, we assigned a score equal (according to the Porter - Pineo index) to one who lives on welfare, that is 7.3 or the 9th rank, instead of giving a score of 0 and 10th rank. The reasoning is as follows: if one of the parents is deceased, the surviving parent receives some sort of compensation, a form of social assistance. In the case of a separation, it is generally the female who keeps the children and she receives a form of social assistance. Therefore, in these cases, the economic level of the family (combined parents' occupations) will be calculated based on the surviving parent's occupation and the economic status of a person on social assistance.

For housewives, the task was much more difficult. The Pineo - Porter and Blischen indices do not take this occupation into account. Blischen's rationale is as follows: "Only occupations characteristic of males in the labour force were included, on the assumption that the family's social status is dependent upon the occupation of the husband rather than the wife when both are working."(4)

On the other hand, studies have indicated that the economic value of a housewife's work is approximately $18,000. It is also highly probable that an evaluation of prestige as undertaken by Porter and Pineo would have given a relatively high score for this occupation, but for a different reason, that is, the affective factor which it involves.

If we calculated the domestic work of a man who does not receive a salary for his work, we would arrive at an even higher income. For example, a competent laborer who earns, say $12,000 a year, and who does all repairs to his home, that is the work of a carpenter, plumber, electrician, etc., would have a yearly net salary of around $16,000. However, this type of domestic work could also be done by a doctor or a judge. There is no way of knowing.

---

(4) Bernard R. Blischen, op. cit., p. 42.

Therefore, we had to find the "real" value of a housewife. To do this, we posed this question: what would happen if there was no housewife? The answer was: the father of the family, as his means would allow, would hire someone to take care of the children and to do the housework.

Generally, these employees are paid salaries which are very close to the minimum wage of a labourer. For this reason, we decided to place the housewives at the same level as the labourer, that is the 7th rank.

The unemployed category (code 13) received the same score as those who live on welfare, in the opinion of Porter and Pineo, that is 7.3 or a 9th rank. Since the questionnaires were administered in mid-May, it is very likely that the unemployed in question are chronically unemployed or welfare recipients, given that the latter were thus classified for our means.

Students were calculated directly from the figures given by Pineo and Porter. We judge that a mother or father returning to school does not do so to prepare for employment as a lumberjack (code 6), farmer (code 5) or a laborer (code 11). Therefore we have calculated a score equivalent to the average of probable occupations, that is, administrators (code 1), liberal professionals and technicians (code 2), office workers (code 3), service personnel (code 4), skilled workers (code 7) or salesperson (code 8). The score came out to 45.85 which ranks 4th.

Porter and Pineo make no distinction between administrators and the self-employed (code 17). For this reason, we have isolated the occupations of the self-employed and recalculated their score, based on each individual occupation (45.81 which places 4th).

If we observe the frequency of adults in the occupations of codes 18 (athlete) and 19 (artist), we realize that it is negligible. These careers have, in recent years, experienced a rise in both prestige and salary. For the artists, the prestige has increased and for athletes the salaries have improved. Since these occupations were non-existent in Pineo and Porter's work, we used Blischen's scores. Hence the athletes have a score of 51.11 and occupy the 3rd rank, whereas artists occupy the same rank with a score of 52.04.

It is by these means that we have arrived at the rank in the right column of Table A - 1A. These ranks were used in the calculation of the parents' socio-economic status.

TABLE A - 1 A

RANK OF OCCUPATIONS FOR SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS

Code	Occupational categories	Weights Porter-Pineo	Blischen Rank
0)	Does not apply (father/mother deceased or couple separated)	-	9*
1)	Administrator	60.38	1
2)	Liberal profession and technicians	64.11	1
3)	Office worker	37.46	5
4)	Recreational activities and services personnel and transportation and communication personnel	(39.09)*	4
5)	Farmer and agriculturally related jobs	34.98	5
6)	Lumberjack and forestry personnel, fisherman, hunter and trapper, miner, quarryman and those with similar occupations	(29.61)*	6
7)	Production worker and those with similar occupations	36.55	5
8)	Salesperson	36.99	5
9)	No answer	-	Average
10)	Housewife	-	7*
11)	Laborer	21.47	7
12)	Retired	-	Average
13)	Unemployed	7.3*	9
14)	Student	(45.85)*	4
15)	Others (not specified)	-	Average
16)	Undecided	-	Average
17)	Self-employed	(45.81)*	4
18)	Athlete	(51.11)*	3
19)	Artist	(52.04)*	3

* our rank, our weight

TABLE A - 1B

CORRELATION MATRIX OF VARIABLES USED TO CREATE THE SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS INDEX - GRADE 3

Variables	Father's Education	Mother's Education	Family Income	Father's Occupation	Mother's Occupation
Father's Education	1.0000 *****	0.5246 0.000	0.4752 0.000	0.2099 0.015	0.0612 0.232
Mother's Education	0.5246 0.000	1.0000 *****	0.1703 0.017	0.0271 0.387	0.1209 0.071
Family Income	0.4752 0.000	0.1703 0.017	1.0000 *****	0.2904 0.002	-0.0321 0.356
Father's Occupation	0.2099 0.015	0.0271 0.387	0.2904 0.002	1.0000 *****	0.0301 0.379
Mother's Occupation	0.0612 0.232	0.1209 0.071	-0.0321 0.356	0.0301 0.379	1.0000 *****

TABLE A - 1C

CORRELATION MATRIX OF VARIABLES USED TO CREATE THE SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS INDEX - GRADE 6

Variables	Father's Education	Mother's Education	Family Income	Father's Occupation	Mother's Occupation
Father's Education	1.0000 *****	0.3685 0.002	0.5925 0.000	0.2800 0.052	- 0.0263 0.430
Mother's Education	0.3685 0.002	1.0000 *****	0.2836 0.023	0.1021 0.277	0.0211 0.443
Family Income	0.5925 0.000	0.2836 0.023	1.0000 *****	0.3890 0.018	0.1568 0.177
Father's Occupation	0.2800 0.052	0.1021 0.277	0.3890 0.018	1.0000 *****	0.0952 0.296
Mother's Occupation	- 0.0263 0.430	0.0211 0.443	0.1568 0.177	0.0952 0.296	1.0000 *****

TABLE A - 1D

GRADE 9

Variables	Father's Education	Mother's Education	Family Income	Father's Occupation	Mother's Occupation
Father's Education	1.0000 *****	0.2298 0.060	0.2187 0.088	0.0340 0.439	- 0.2612 0.057
Mother's Education	0.2298 0.060	1.0000 *****	0.2193 0.084	0.3274 0.059	0.0168 0.460
Family Income	0.2187 0.088	0.2193 0.084	1.0000 *****	0.4308 0.029	- 0.1356 0.230
Father's Occupation	0.0340 0.439	0.3274 0.059	0.4308 0.029	1.0000 *****	- 0.0247 0.459
Mother's Occupation	- 0.2612 0.057	0.0168 0.460	-0.1356 0.230	- 0.0247 0.459	1.0000 *****

TABLE A - 1E

AVERAGE AGE OF STUDENTS*, BY GROUP AND GRADE

GRADE 3

Group	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mean	106.4	107.5	106.9	106.4	110.2	107.9
Minimum	96.0	100.0	99.0	100.0	102.0	101.0
Maximum	114.0	124.0	123.0	111.0	118.0	122.0
Standard deviation	3.666	5.358	4.424	3.441	4.442	5.196

GRADE 6

Group	1	2	3	4
Mean	142.7	144.1	145.6	143.5
Minimum	136.0	131.0	137.0	138.0
Maximum	156.0	162.0	159.0	149.0
Standard deviation	4.612	6.545	6.128	3.705

GRADE 9

Group	1	2	3
Mean	178.8	179.0	177.7
Minimum	171.0	171.0	169.0
Maximum	184.0	183.0	186.0
Standard deviation	3.423	3.443	4.261

* In months as of May 31, 1980

APPENDIX 7

TABLE A - 2

TOTAL NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN FAMILY AND SCHOOL-AGED CHILDREN ENROLLED IN FRENCH IMMERSION PROGRAMMES, BY GROUP

GRADE 3

Group	Total number of children in family	Total number of school-aged children	Total number of children in French immersion	Total immersion / Total school-age
1	27	27	20	74 %
2	38	37	26	70 %
3	51	45	40	89 %
4	19	17	15	88 %
5	17	16	11	69 %
6	14	14	5	36 %
Total	166	156	117	75 %

TABLE A - 3

TOTAL NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN FAMILY AND SCHOOL-AGED CHILDREN ENROLLED IN FRENCH IMMERSION PROGRAMMES, BY GROUP

GRADE 6

Group	Total number of children in family	Total number of school-aged children	Total number of children in French immersion	Total immersion / Total school-age
1	23	23	14	61 %
2	26	23	20	87 %
3	7	7	6	86 %
4	13	13	11	85 %
Total	69	66	51	77 %

TABLE A - 4

TOTAL NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN FAMILY AND SCHOOL-AGED CHILDREN ENROLLED IN FRENCH IMMERSION PROGRAMMES, BY GROUP - GRADE 9

Group	Total number of children in family	Total number of school-aged children	Total number of children in French immersion	Total immersion / Total school-age
1	7	7	5	71 %
2	9	8	8	100 %
3	36	32	10	31 %
Total	52	47	23	49 %

TABLE A - 5

LANGUAGE SPOKEN AT HOME BY FATHER, BY GROUP - GRADE 3

Group	English only	English & French	French only	English & other	French & other	English, French & other	Other only
1 N=31	18 (58.1)	9 (29.0)	2 (6.5)	2 (6.5)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
2 N=30	21 (70.0)	8 (26.7)	0 (0.0)	1 (3.3)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
3 N=41	29 (70.7)	7 (17.1)	1 (2.4)	2 (4.9)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (4.9)
4 N=14	12 (85.7)	2 (14.3)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
5 N=15	14 (93.3)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (6.7)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
6 N=10	8 (80.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (10.0)	1 (10.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
TOTAL	102 (72.3)	26 (18.4)	4 (2.8)	7 (5.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (1.4)

TABLE A - 6

LANGUAGE SPOKEN AT HOME BY MOTHER, BY GROUP

GRADE 3

Group	English only	English & French	French only	English & other	French & other	English, French & other	Other only
1 N=35	23 (65.7)	6 (17.1)	3 (8.6)	3 (8.6)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
2 N=32	23 (71.9)	7 (21.9)	0 (0.0)	2 (6.3)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
3 N=47	34 (72.3)	7 (14.9)	1 (2.1)	2 (4.3)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	3 (6.4)
4 N=14	12 (85.7)	1 (7.1)	0 (0.0)	1 (7.1)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
5 N=15	11 (73.3)	2 (13.3)	0 (0.0)	2 (13.3)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
6 N=10	8 (80.0)	1 (10.0)	1 (10.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
TOTAL	111 (72.5)	24 (15.7)	5 (3.3)	10 (6.5)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	3 (2.0)

TABLE A - 7

LANGUAGE SPOKEN AT HOME BY CHILD, BY GROUP

GRADE 3

Group	English only	English & French	French only	English & other	French & other	English, French & other	Other only
1 N=35	19 (54.3)	13 (37.1)	2 (5.7)	1 (2.9)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
2 N=32	21 (65.6)	11 (34.4)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
3 N=47	30 (63.8)	14 (29.8)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (2.1)	0 (0.0)	2 (4.3)
4 N=15	12 (80.0)	3 (20.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
5 N=15	13 (86.7)	1 (6.7)	0 (0.0)	1 (6.7)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
6 N=10	9 (90.0)	1 (10.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
TOTAL	104 (67.5)	43 (27.9)	2 (1.3)	2 (1.3)	1 (0.6)	0 (0.0)	2 (1.3)

TABLE A - 8

LANGUAGE SPOKEN AT HOME BY BROTHERS AND SISTERS, BY GROUP

GRADE 3

Group	English only	English & French	French only	English & other	French & other	English, French & other	Other only
1 N=28	22 (78.6)	4 (14.3)	2 (7.1)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
2 N=28	20 (71.4)	8 (28.6)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
3 N=45	30 (60.7)	12 (26.7)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (2.2)	2 (4.4)
4 N=13	11 (80.6)	2 (15.4)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
5 N=13	12 (92.3)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (7.7)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
6 N=10	8 (80.0)	1 (10.0)	1 (10.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
TOTAL	103 (75.2)	27 (19.7)	3 (2.2)	1 (0.7)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.7)	2 (1.5)

TABLE A - 9

LANGUAGE SPOKEN AT HOME BY FATHER, BY GROUP - GRADE 6

Group	English only	English & French	French only	English & other	French & other	English, French & other	Other only
1 N=20	19 (95.0)	1 (5.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
2 N=20	15 (75.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (10.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	3 (15.0)
3 N=6	6 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
4 N=10	7 (70.0)	1 (10.0)	2 (20.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
TOTAL	47 (83.9)	2 (3.6)	2 (3.6)	2 (3.6)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	3 (5.4)

TABLE A - 10

LANGUAGE SPOKEN AT HOME BY MOTHER, BY GROUP - GRADE 6

Group	English only	English & French	French only	English & other	French & other	English, French & other	Other only
1 N=20	15 (75.0)	4 (20.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (5.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
2 N=20	14 (70.0)	1 (5.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (10.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	3 (15.0)
3 N=6	6 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
4 N=10	7 (70.0)	1 (10.0)	2 (20.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
TOTAL	42 (75.0)	6 (10.7)	2 (3.6)	3 (5.4)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	3 (5.4)

TABLE A - 11

LANGUAGE SPOKEN AT HOME BY CHILD, BY GROUP - GRADE 6

Group	English only	English & French	French only	English & other	French & other	English, French & other	Other only
1 N=20	18 (90.0)	2 (10.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
2 N=21	14 (66.7)	3 (14.3)	0 (0.0)	2 (9.5)	0 (0.0)	1 (4.8)	1 (4.8)
3 N=6	6 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
4 N=10	9 (90.0)	1 (10.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
TOTAL	54 (84.4)	6 (9.4)	0 (0.0)	2 (3.1)	0 (0.0)	1 (1.6)	1 (1.6)

TABLE A - 12

LANGUAGE SPOKEN AT HOME BY BROTHERS AND SISTERS, BY GROUP - GRADE 6

Group	English only	English & French	French only	English & other	French & other	English, French & other	Other only
1 N=19	16 (84.2)	3 (15.8)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
2 N=18	12 (66.7)	2 (11.1)	0 (0.0)	1 (5.6)	0 (0.0)	2 (11.1)	1 (5.6)
3 N=6	6 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
4 N=10	8 (80.0)	2 (20.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
TOTAL	42 (79.2)	7 (13.2)	0 (0.0)	1 (1.9)	0 (0.0)	2 (3.8)	1 (1.9)

TABLE A - 13

LANGUAGE SPOKEN AT HOME BY FATHER, BY GROUP - GRADE 9

Group	English only	English & French	French only	English & other	French & other	English, French & other	Other only
1 N=8	8 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
2 N=8	5 (62.5)	2 (25.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (12.5)
3 N=28	25 (89.3)	1 (3.6)	0 (0.0)	2 (7.1)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
TOTAL	38 (86.4)	3 (6.8)	0 (0.0)	2 (4.5)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (2.3)

TABLE A - 14

LANGUAGE SPOKEN AT HOME BY MOTHER, BY GROUP - GRADE 9

Group	English only	English & French	French only	English & other	French & other	English, French & other	Other only
1 N=9	9 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
2 N=8	6 (75.0)	1 (12.5)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (12.5)
3 N=31	24 (77.4)	2 (6.5)	0 (0.0)	5 (16.1)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
TOTAL	39 (81.3)	3 (6.3)	0 (0.0)	5 (10.4)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (2.1)

TABLE A - 15

LANGUAGE SPOKEN AT HOME BY CHILD, BY GROUP - GRADE 9

Group	English only	English & French	French only	English & other	French & other	English, French & other	Other only
1 N=9	7 (77.8)	2 (22.2)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
2 N=8	6 (75.0)	2 (25.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
3 N=31	27 (87.1)	2 (6.5)	0 (0.0)	2 (6.5)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
TOTAL	40 (83.3)	6 (12.5)	0 (0.0)	2 (4.2)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)

TABLE A - 16

LANGUAGE SPOKEN AT HOME BY BROTHERS AND SISTERS, BY GROUP - GRADE 9

Group	English only	English & French	French only	English & other	French & other	English, French & other	Other only
1 N=8	7 (87.5)	1 (12.5)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
2 N=7	5 (71.4)	2 (28.6)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
3 N=31	27 (87.1)	1 (3.2)	0 (0.0)	2 (6.5)	0 (0.0)	1 (3.2)	0 (0.0)
TOTAL	39 (84.8)	4 (8.7)	0 (0.0)	2 (4.3)	0 (0.0)	1 (2.2)	0 (0.0)

TABLE A - 17

FIRST LANGUAGE SPOKEN AND STILL UNDERSTOOD BY FATHER - GRADE 3

Group	English	French	Other
1 N=33	24 (72.7)	8 (24.2)	1 (3.0)
2 N=32	20 (62.5)	10 (31.3)	2 (6.3)
3 N=43	31 (72.1)	6 (14.0)	6 (13.9)
4 N=14	10 (71.4)	2 (14.3)	2 (14.3)
5 N=15	12 (80.0)	2 (13.3)	1 (6.7)
6 N=10	6 (60.0)	3 (30.0)	1 (10.0)
TOTAL	103 (70.1)	31 (21.1)	13 (8.8)

TABLE A - 18

FIRST LANGUAGE SPOKEN AND STILL UNDERSTOOD BY MOTHER - GRADE 3

Group	English	French	Other
1 N=35	23 (65.7)	9 (25.7)	3 (8.6)
2 N=32	24 (75.0)	5 (15.6)	3 (6.3)
3 N=47	36 (76.6)	3 (6.4)	8 (17.0)
4 N=14	13 (92.9)	1 (7.1)	0 (0.0)
5 N=15	10 (66.7)	3 (20.0)	2 (13.4)
6 N=10	8 (80.0)	2 (20.0)	0 (0.0)
TOTAL	114 (74.5)	23 (15.0)	16 (10.5)

TABLE A - 19

FIRST LANGUAGE SPOKEN AND STILL UNDERSTOOD BY FATHER - GRADE 6

Group	English	French	Other
1 N=20	15 (75.0)	4 (20.0)	1 (5.0)
2 N=19	12 (63.2)	0 (0.0)	7 (36.8)
3 N=6	6 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
4 N=10	6 (60.0)	3 (30.0)	1 (10.0)
TOTAL	39 (70.9)	7 (12.7)	9 (16.4)

TABLE A - 20

FIRST LANGUAGE SPOKEN AND STILL UNDERSTOOD BY MOTHER - GRADE 6

Group	English	French	Other
1 N=20	14 (70.0)	4 (20.0)	2 (10.0)
2 N=20	12 (60.0)	1 (5.0)	7 (35.0)
3 N=6	4 (66.7)	0 (0.0)	2 (33.3)
4 N=10	5 (50.0)	4 (40.0)	1 (10.0)
TOTAL	35 (62.5)	9 (16.1)	12 (21.4)

TABLE A - 21

FIRST LANGUAGE SPOKEN AND STILL UNDERSTOOD BY FATHER - GRADE 9

Group	English	French	Other
1 N=9	7 (77.8)	1 (11.1)	1 (11.1)
2 N=8	6 (75.0)	1 (12.5)	1 (12.5)
3 N=27	21 (77.8)	2 (7.4)	4 (14.8)
TOTAL	34 (77.3)	4 (9.1)	6 (13.6)

TABLE A - 22

FIRST LANGUAGE SPOKEN AND STILL UNDERSTOOD BY MOTHER - GRADE 9

Group	English	French	Other
1 N=9	6 (66.7)	2 (22.2)	1 (11.1)
2 N=8	7 (87.5)	0 (0.0)	1 (12.5)
3 N=30	24 (80.0)	0 (0.0)	6 (20.0)
TOTAL	37 (78.7)	2 (4.3)	8 (17.0)

TABLE A - 23

FATHER'S ABILITY TO SPEAK FRENCH BY GROUP

GRADE 3

Group	Speak fluently	Conversational	Understand but can't speak	None
1 N=33	10 (30.3)	4 (12.1)	3 (9.1)	16 (48.5)
2 N=32	8 (25.0)	5 (15.6)	7 (21.9)	12 (37.5)
3 N=43	7 (16.3)	10 (23.3)	14 (32.6)	12 (27.9)
4 N=14	2 (14.3)	1 (7.1)	5 (35.7)	6 (42.9)
5 N=15	3 (20.0)	2 (13.3)	2 (13.3)	8 (53.3)
6 N=10	4 (40.0)	1 (10.0)	0 (0.0)	5 (50.0)
TOTAL	34 (23.1)	23 (15.6)	31 (21.1)	59 (40.1)

TABLE A - 24

MOTHER'S ABILITY TO SPEAK FRENCH BY GROUP

GRADE 3

Group	Speak fluently	Conversational	Understand but can't speak	None
1 N=35	10 (28.6)	2 (5.7)	7 (20.0)	16 (45.7)
2 N=32	5 (15.6)	5 (15.6)	9 (28.1)	13 (40.6)
3 N=47	7 (14.9)	9 (19.1)	16 (34.0)	15 (31.9)
4 N=14	0 (0.0)	2 (14.3)	5 (35.7)	7 (50.0)
5 N=15	3 (20.0)	3 (20.0)	4 (26.7)	5 (33.3)
6 N=10	2 (20.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (20.0)	6 (60.0)
TOTAL	27 (17.6)	21 (13.7)	43 (28.1)	62 (40.5)

TABLE A - 25

FATHER'S ABILITY TO SPEAK FRENCH BY GROUP - GRADE 6

Group	Speak fluently	Conversational	Understand but can't speak	None
1 N=20	3 (15.0)	2 (10.0)	7 (35.0)	8 (40.0)
2 N=20	1 (5.0)	4 (20.0)	4 (20.0)	11 (55.0)
3 N=6	0 (0.0)	2 (33.3)	1 (16.7)	3 (50.0)
4 N=10	4 (40.0)	0 (0.0)	4 (40.0)	2 (20.0)
TOTAL	8 (14.3)	8 (14.3)	16 (28.6)	24 (42.9)

TABLE A - 26

MOTHER'S ABILITY TO SPEAK FRENCH BY GROUP - GRADE 6

Group	Speak fluently	Conversational	Understand but can't speak	None
1 N=20	5 (25.0)	2 (10.0)	4 (20.0)	9 (45.0)
2 N=21	2 (9.5)	5 (23.8)	6 (28.6)	8 (38.1)
3 N=6	1 (16.7)	1 (16.7)	0 (0.0)	4 (66.7)
4 N=10	5 (50.0)	1 (10.0)	2 (20.0)	2 (20.0)
TOTAL	13 (22.8)	9 (15.8)	12 (21.1)	23 (40.4)

TABLE A - 27

FATHER'S ABILITY TO SPEAK FRENCH BY GROUP

GRADE 9

Group	Speak fluently	Conver-sational	Understand but can't speak	None
1 N=9	1 (11.1)	3 (33.3)	2 (22.2)	3 (33.3)
2 N=8	2 (25.0)	2 (25.0)	2 (25.0)	2 (25.0)
3 N=27	3 (11.1)	8 (29.6)	5 (18.5)	11 (40.7)
TOTAL	6 (13.6)	13 (29.5)	9 (20.5)	16 (36.4)

TABLE A - 28

MOTHER'S ABILITY TO SPEAK FRENCH BY GROUP

GRADE 9

Group	Speak fluently	Conver-sational	Understand but can't speak	None
1 N=9	2 (22.2)	2 (22.2)	0 (0.0)	5 (55.6)
2 N=8	2 (25.0)	1 (12.5)	2 (25.0)	3 (37.5)
3 N=31	0 (0.0)	11 (35.5)	10 (32.3)	11 (32.3)
TOTAL	4 (8.3)	14 (29.2)	12 (25.0)	18 (37.5)

TABLE A - 29

TEACHERS' EVALUATION OF CURRICULUM GUIDES BY SUBJECT, SETTING AND LEVEL

KINDERGARTEN TO GRADE 3

Subject	Setting	Adequate and suitable	Suitable but not enough	not suitable	non-existent
French language arts	English	66.7%	22.2%	11.1%	0.0%
	N =	6	2	1	0
	Immersion	79.3%	10.3%	6.9%	3.4%
	N =	23	3	2	1
English language arts	English	80.0%	0.0%	20.0%	0.0%
	N =	4	0	1	0
	Immersion	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	16	0	0	0
Mathematics	English	88.9%	0.0%	0.0%	11.1%
	N =	8	0	0	1
	Immersion	86.2%	13.8%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	25	4	0	0
Science	English	42.9%	14.3%	28.6%	14.3%
	N =	3	1	2	1
	Immersion	48.1%	18.5%	22.2%	11.1%
	N =	13	5	6	3
Social studies	English	75.0%	12.5%	12.5%	0.0%
	N =	6	1	1	0
	Immersion	77.8%	14.8%	7.4%	0.0%
	N =	21	4	2	0

TABLE A - 30

TEACHERS' EVALUATION OF CURRICULUM GUIDES BY SUBJECT, SETTING AND LEVEL

GRADE 4 TO GRADE 6

Subject	Setting	Adequate and suitable	Suitable but not enough	not suitable	non-existent
French language arts	English	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	N =	0	0	0	2
	Immersion	31.3%	12.5%	25.0%	31.3%
	N =	5	2	4	5
English language arts	English	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	2	0	0	0
	Immersion	86.7%	13.3%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	13	2	0	0
Mathematics	English	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	2	0	0	0
	Immersion	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	14	0	0	0
Science	English	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	2	0	0	0
	Immersion	64.3%	28.6%	7.1%	0.0%
	N =	9	4	1	0
Social studies	English	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%
	N =	0	0	1	1
	Immersion	43.8%	25.0%	18.8%	12.5%
	N =	7	4	3	2

TABLE A - 31

TEACHERS' EVALUATION OF CURRICULUM GUIDES BY SUBJECT, SETTING AND LEVEL

GRADE 7 TO GRADE 9

Evaluation / Subject	Setting	Adequate and suitable	Suitable but not enough	not suitable	non-existent
French language arts	English	40.0%	30.0%	0.0%	30.0%
	N =	4	3	0	3
	Immersion	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	1	0	0	0
English language arts	English	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	1	0	0	0
	Immersion	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	1	0	0	0
Mathematics	English	85.7%	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%
	N =	6	0	0	1
	Immersion	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	1	0	0	0
Science	English	66.7%	16.7%	0.0%	16.7%
	N =	4	1	0	1
	Immersion	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	1	0	0	0
Social studies	English	71.4%	0.0%	14.3%	14.3%
	N =	5	0	1	1
	Immersion	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	1	0	0	0

TABLE A - 32

TEACHERS' EVALUATION OF CURRICULUM GUIDES BY SUBJECT, SETTING AND LEVEL

GRADE 10 TO GRADE 12

Evaluation / Subject	Setting	Adequate and suitable	Suitable but not enough	not suitable	non-existent
French language arts	English	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	2	0	0	0
	Immersion	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	0	0	0	0
English language arts	English	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	3	0	0	0
	Immersion	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	0	0	0	0
Mathematics	English	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	3	0	0	0
	Immersion	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	0	0	0	0
Science	English	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	0	1	0	0
	Immersion	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	0	0	0	0
Social studies	English	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	1	1	0	0
	Immersion	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	0	0	0	0

TABLE A - 33

TEACHERS' EVALUATION OF TEXTBOOKS BY SUBJECT, SETTING AND LEVEL

KINDERGARTEN TO GRADE 3

Subject	Setting	Adequate and suitable	Suitable but not enough	not suitable	non-existent
French language arts	English	90.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.0%
	N =	9	0	0	1
	Immersion	61.5%	30.8%	0.0%	7.7%
	N =	16	8	0	2
English language arts	English	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	6	0	0	0
	Immersion	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	15	0	0	0
Mathematics	English	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	9	0	0	0
	Immersion	84.0%	12.0%	0.0%	4.0%
	N =	21	3	0	1
Science	English	57.1%	0.0%	28.6%	14.3%
	N =	4	0	2	1
	Immersion	13.6%	22.7%	50.0%	13.6%
	N =	3	5	11	3
Social studies	English	77.8%	11.1%	11.1%	0.0%
	N =	7	1	1	0
	Immersion	57.1%	19.0%	9.5%	14.3%
	N =	12	4	2	3

TABLE A - 34

TEACHERS' EVALUATION OF TEXTBOOKS BY SUBJECT, SETTING AND LEVEL

GRADE 4 TO GRADE 6

Subject	Setting	Adequate and suitable	Suitable but not enough	not suitable	non-existent
French language arts	English	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	1	0	0	0
	Immersion	33.3%	53.3%	13.3%	0.0%
	N =	5	8	2	0
English language arts	English	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	2	0	0	0
	Immersion	71.4%	28.4%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	10	4	0	0
Mathematics	English	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	2	0	0	0
	Immersion	92.9%	7.1%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	13	1	0	0
Science	English	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	2	0	0	0
	Immersion	40.0%	26.7%	26.7%	6.7%
	N =	6	4	4	1
Social studies	English	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
	N =	0	0	2	0
	Immersion	31.3%	37.5%	12.5%	18.8%
	N =	5	6	2	3

TABLE A - 35

TEACHERS' EVALUATION OF TEXTBOOKS BY SUBJECT, SETTING AND LEVEL

GRADE 7 TO GRADE 9

Evaluation / Subject	Setting	Adequate and suitable	Suitable but not enough	not suitable	non-existent
French language arts	English	27.3%	45.5%	27.3%	0.0%
	N =	3	5	3	0
	Immersion	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
	N =	0	0	1	0
English language arts	English	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	1	1	0	0
	Immersion	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	1	0	0	0
Mathematics	English	50.0%	25.0%	25.0%	0.0%
	N =	4	2	2	0
	Immersion	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	1	0	0	0
Science	English	16.7%	16.7%	66.7%	0.0%
	N =	1	1	4	0
	Immersion	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	1	0	0	0
Social studies	English	0.0%	44.4%	33.3%	22.2%
	N =	0	4	3	2
	Immersion	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	1	0	0	0

TABLE A - 36

TEACHERS' EVALUATION OF TEXTBOOKS BY SUBJECT, SETTING AND LEVEL

GRADE 10 TO GRADE 12

Subject / Evaluation	Setting	Adequate and suitable	Suitable but not enough	not suitable	non-existent
French language arts	English	66.7%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	2	1	0	0
	Immersion	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	0	0	0	0
English language arts	English	66.7%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	2	1	0	0
	Immersion	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	0	0	0	0
Mathematics	English	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	3	0	0	0
	Immersion	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	0	0	0	0
Science	English	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	0	1	0	0
	Immersion	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	0	0	0	0
Social studies	English	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	1	1	0	0
	Immersion	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	0	0	0	0

TABLE A - 37

TEACHERS' EVALUATION OF BACKUP RESOURCES AVAILABLE, BY SETTING AND LEVEL

KINDERGARTEN TO GRADE 3

Subject	Setting	Adequate and suitable	Suitable but not enough	not suitable	non-existent
Film, filmstrips, etc.	English	72.7%	27.3%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	8	3	0	0
	Immersion	62.2%	37.8%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	23	14	0	0
Records and tapes	English	80.0%	20.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	8	2	0	0
	Immersion	62.2%	37.8%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	23	14	0	0
Radio and T.V. broadcasts	English	33.3%	22.2%	44.4%	0.0%
	N =	3	2	4	0
	Immersion	34.8%	52.2%	13.0%	0.0%
	N =	8	12	3	0
Posters and other visual aids	English	54.5%	45.5%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	6	5	0	0
	Immersion	55.9%	38.2%	2.9%	2.9%
	N =	19	13	1	1
Cultural activities	English	40.0%	60.4%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	4	6	0	0
	Immersion	50.0%	46.4%	3.6%	0.0%
	N =	14	13	1	0
Supplementary books	English	70.0%	30.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	7	3	0	0
	Immersion	62.5%	31.3%	6.3%	0.0%
	N =	20	10	2	0

TABLE A - 38

TEACHERS' EVALUATION OF BACKUP RESOURCES AVAILABLE, BY SETTING AND LEVEL

GRADE 4 TO GRADE 6

Subject	Setting	Adequate and suitable	Suitable but not enough	not suitable	non-existent
Film, filmstrips, etc.	English	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	1	1	0	0
	Immersion	58.8%	35.3%	0.0%	5.9%
	N =	10	6	0	1
Records and tapes	English	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	0	2	0	0
	Immersion	62.5%	25.0%	6.3%	6.3%
	N =	10	4	1	1
Radio and T.V. broadcasts	English	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	0	2	0	0
	Immersion	40.0%	33.3%	26.7%	0.0%
	N =	6	5	4	0
Posters and other visual aids	English	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	0	2	0	0
	Immersion	31.3%	50.0%	18.8%	0.0%
	N =	5	8	3	0
Cultural activities	English	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	1	1	0	0
	Immersion	38.5%	46.2%	15.4%	0.0%
	N =	5	6	2	0
Supplementary books	English	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	0	1	0	0
	Immersion	35.3%	58.8%	5.9%	0.0%
	N =	6	10	1	0

TABLE A - 39

TEACHERS' EVALUATION OF BACKUP RESOURCES AVAILABLE, BY SETTING AND LEVEL

GRADE 7 TO GRADE 9

Evaluation / Subject	Setting	Adequate and suitable	Suitable but not enough	not suitable	non-existent
Film, filmstrips, etc.	English	28.6%	57.1%	14.3%	0.0%
	N =	4	8	2	0
	Immersion	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	1	0	0	0
Records and tapes	English	44.4%	44.4%	11.1%	0.0%
	N =	4	4	1	0
	Immersion	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	1	0	0	0
Radio and T.V. broadcasts	English	0.0%	77.8%	11.1%	11.1%
	N =	0	7	1	1
	Immersion	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
	N =	0	0	1	0
Posters and other visual aids	English	53.8%	38.5%	7.7%	0.0%
	N =	7	5	1	0
	Immersion	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	0	1	0	0
Cultural activities	English	10.0%	80.0%	10.0%	0.0%
	N =	1	8	1	0
	Immersion	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	1	0	0	0
Supplementary books	English	38.5%	46.2%	15.4%	0.0%
	N =	5	6	2	0
	Immersion	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	1	0	0	0

TABLE A - 40

TEACHERS' EVALUATION OF BACKUP RESOURCES AVAILABLE, BY SETTING AND LEVEL

GRADE 10 TO GRADE 12

Subject	Setting	Adequate and suitable	Suitable but not enough	not suitable	non-existent
Film, filmstrips, etc.	English	33.3%	66.7%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	1	2	0	0
	Immersion	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	0	0	0	0
Records and tapes	English	33.3%	66.7%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	1	2	0	0
	Immersion	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	0	0	0	0
Radio and T.V. broadcasts	English	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	0	1	0	0
	Immersion	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	0	0	0	0
Posters and other visual aids	English	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	1	1	0	0
	Immersion	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	0	0	0	0
Cultural activities	English	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	1	1	0	0
	Immersion	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	0	0	0	0
Supplementary books	English	33.3%	66.7%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	1	2	0	0
	Immersion	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	N =	0	0	0	0